



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



*The Invalidity of the Lay-Baptisms of
Dissenting Teachers.*

PROV'D FROM
SCRIPTURE and ANTIQUITY,
And from the Judgment of the
Church of England,

A N D

Many Divines Dead and Living; from Mr. Calvin,
and the Reformed abroad; the old Puritans, the present
Kirk of *Scotland*, and also from the Subscription the present
Dissenting Teachers make to the 23d Article of the Church
of ENGLAND.

IN ANSWER to a late PAMPHLET, compil'd
chiefly of Collections from the Bishop of *Salisbury's* Writings,
and the Bishop of *Oxford's* Charge, by Mr. Shaw, a Dissent-
ing Teacher in *Derby*, Intituled, *The Validity of Baptism ad-
ministr'd by Dissenting Ministers.*

To which is added,

A Vindication of the CLERGY's refusal to read
the Burial-Office over unbaptiz'd Persons, shewing the Rea-
sonableness of such Refusal.

WITH AN
APPENDIX.

By HENRY CANTRELL, M. A.
Vicar of *St. Alkmund's, Derby.*

With a LETTER from the Reverend Mr. Harris.

Nottingham: Printed by *William Asycough* for *J. Rodger* Bookseller:
of *Derby*, 1714.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY



To the Reverend
Mr. CANTRELL.

REVEREND SIR.

I Being pointed at (as 'tis suppos'd) in the late Trifling Pamphlet, Entituled, *The Validity of Baptism administered by Dissenting Ministers, &c.* which I understand is now under your Consideration, I look upon my self concern'd to give some Answer to it : But that I may not interfere with your Undertaking, nor trouble the World with a Needless Distinct Book, I shall at present, only, make the following short Remarks upon Mr Shaw's doughty Berforesomance, which I desire You will publish in your Reply, and which, I humbly hope, will both expose His Weakness, and Justify My Conduct.

First then, Mr. Shaw pretends in his Title Page to *instruct* upon, and prove the Validity of Baptism administered by Dissenting Ministers, whereas his poor Pamphlet contains not Three Lines on that Point, being only stufed with Quotations of Private Opinions; (which, by the Way, are of no Force against the standing Rules and Authority of the Church,) for the Validity of Lay-Baptism; so that he has stumbled at the Threshold; having either given his Book a False Title, or yielded himself and Fraternity to be only upon the Level with Lay-Persons.

Secondly, Mr. Shaw drops the Opinion and Principles

ples of his Predecessors; the Antient Puritans, in that He stands up for the Validity of Lay Baptism; whereas they strenuously oppos'd it.

Thirdly, 'Tis a foul Sign he's much unqualify'd for his Undertaking on this Point, when no fresh Supply of Argument or Authority is brought by him to support it, nor any thing alledg'd but what has been * already more than once sufficiently Pass'd. And 'tis no less evident he's much distress'd for Authors, when he's forc'd to depend upon Such to Justify his Ministrations, who All of them Deny him to be a Minister, and therefore give the direct Lie to that Title & he bestows upon his worthy Self in the Title Page.

Fourthly, Though Mr. Shaw (p. 11) blames some for Re-baptizing such as have not receiv'd Episcopal Baptism, because they are contrary to his Authors; I must tell him that however that be, we are conformable to the Doctrine and Laws of that Church of which we are Ministers; For, She owns no Ministers, but such as are Episcopally She permits no Body to be in any Case to Baptize; and by consequence looks upon all such as not Baptiz'd, that they have no Baptiz'd. Nay, and let it be here Remark'd that She discharges us from using the Office of Burial for any that are Unbaptiz'd (i. e. according to her own Doctrine, for any that are not Episcopally Baptiz'd) and let Mr. Shaw prove, if he can, that the Unbaptiz'd (i. e. the not Episcopally Baptiz'd Person) is any more entitled to our Church's Office of Burial, than she Excommunicate, (now)

Mr. Lawrence's and Dr. Bury's Performances against the Validity of Lay Baptism.

He styles himself a Presbyter of the Church of Christ.

|| Vid. Rubrick before the Office of Ordination.

|| Vid. Rubrick before the Office of Private Baptism.

|| Vid. Rubrick before the Office of Burial.

or such as lay violent Hands upon themselves (mention'd likewise in the Rubrick here refer'd to) notwithstanding the * 68th Canon; and when he has done that, he will have more Reason to Venerate and Honour as he does, P. 15th. So that though our Practice may be Different to the Opinion of some Great Men, yet we humbly conceive it very Consonant to the Rules of our Church, which we are under the strictest Obligations to observe; both with Regard to our Re-baptizing of, (as he saithly calls it) and to our Denying Burial to, such as are not Episcopally Baptiz'd.

Fifthly, In Answer to what our Author mentions, P. 11. I must here observe, that the last Condemn'd Person, that died at Derby was one William Fall, a Scotchman; this Man, a little before his Death, doubted of the Validity of his Baptism, (having received, as he said, no other than what the Kirk of Scotland pretends to administer,) and humbly and frequently desir'd that he might be admitted to the True Baptism of the Church of Christ. Upon this the provisions Qualifications for it, were laid before him; and the Great Advantages of it explain'd; and he declaring himself qualifi'd, and sensible of the Infinite Advantages that would accrue to him by it, and still pressing for't, that he might be safe, (as he express'd it) was administr'd to him Hypothetically; (lest he should be Mistaken in the Person that pretended to Baptize him before,) and he shew'd himself much satisfi'd after it. Now Mr. Shaw, with a Puritanick Floor, and by a Figure well known to his Party, calls this Great

* M. B. The Rubrick refer'd to, was added before the Office of Burial, many Years since the 68th. Canon was made; and being added by the same Authority, obliges as well as the said Canon. Vid. Dr. Nichol's Note upon the first Rubrick in the Burial Office, compar'd with a Note of his Preface to the Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer, &c.

Great Charity ! And truly, without a Figure, I think it Really was so ; for though the poor Man had lived a Heathen, in a double Sense, and was to die too at the Gallows, yet if he was qualify'd for Baptism by a True Faith and sincere Repentance, all his Actual as well as Original Sins would be wash'd away by it ; he'd be freed from the Wrath of God, and entitled to All the other Favours of the New-Covenant ; which he could not be without Baptism ; and therefore I am still of Opinion, (and I here challenge Mr. Shaw to prove the Contrary) that to give it him was the very Height of Charity. But our Author calls this Baptizing of the Malefactor, just before his Death, an Original ; and the Reason he gives why it is so, is because he, Great Man, never heard of an Instance like it. It may be so indeed, and who shall be accountable for his Ignorance ? But I can inform Mr. Shaw, that had he been but a Little Conversant with the History of the Primitive Church, he might have met with Instances very like it. Thus (to give him one Instance,) 'twas very Common in the Primitive Church, to Baptize Clinicks, (i. e. left this Word should be Greek to Mr. Shaw, Sick and Bed-ridden Persons,) when they desir'd it upon the Approach of Death, had they been never so Wicked, or were never so Old, provided they were Qualifi'd for't by Faith and Repentance, as before mention'd. And if Mr. Shaw, in his Great Wisdom, thinks the Kind of Death that Fall was to die alter'd his Case from that of these Clinicks, and disqualifi'd him for Baptism, let him show me why it did so ; for I am of Opinion, (and I defy him to disprove it,) that let a Man be about to suffer what Kind of Death he can, he may and ought to receive Baptism, if he was never Baptiz'd before, and is Desirous of it, and, as it may be reasonably hop'd, Qualifi'd for it. Now this was Fall's Case, (as was deliver'd on good Grounds ;) He had never been Baptiz'd,

(5)

tiz'd (according to himself;) He was very Desirous of it, and well Qualify'd for it, for ought that could be discover'd, and therefore I think him to have equal Right to Baptism with these Antient Clinicks.

And yet Mr. Shaw runs on in a merry Strain to draw a Parallel between this Action of Baptizing the Malefactor and the Popish Inquisition Baptizing Hereticks, and then delivering them to be burnt; this he doth to make it odious; but alas! poor Man! the Odium falls on his own Head, it being far from amounting to a Parallel; for whereas in his Popish Instance, the Baptizers are the Judges and Condemners of the Newly-Baptiz'd Person, and the Person himself suffers for his Religion; in this Case 'twas far otherwise; Fall being Tried, Condemn'd and deliver'd to Death by the Law, not the Baptizer, and suffering not for his Religion, but a suppos'd Injury and Wrong done by him to his Neighbour, and an Offence against the publick-Laws of the Land. Who then wou'd allow Mr. Shaw's parallel to pass for an Original? And who can help seeing, in this Instance, how this Mighty Author can wade out of his Depth, and talk with Assurance, of he knows not what, and Laugh he knows not Why?

Sixthly, Mr. Shaw informs the World, P. 21. that 'tis said that a certain Curate, being sent to, to bury the Child of a Dissenter in his Parish, he wrote him Word, that for the Good of his Child, (the deceased Child he undoubtedly means,) he would bury it, if some mention'd Conditions were comply'd with. Now because Mr. Shaw in the Beginning of this Part of his Book declares, 'tis about a Resolution lately taken up by some of the Parish Ministers in Town, that he's going to give his Opinion, and because I am the only Curate near Derby, 'tis suppos'd that I am, and indeed I do, of what look upon my self to be the Person here meant; as

I am so, this Scandalous Hearſay of Mr. Shaw's muſt relate to my reſuſing Burial to Samuel Pegg's Child of Normanton in my Pariſh, I having never wrote to any Body elſe upon ſuch an Account. When I ſhew'd this ſhew'd this Paſſage of Mr. Shaw's, (for you ſhew'd it me at the Bookſellers before I had read a Page of his Book,) you know, I immediately, from a Note Caſe in my Pocket, produc'd the very ſame Papers, (as you can atteſt,) that I ſent to Pegg, and he return'd me. I doubt without underſtanding them, theſe Papers I thought to have ſent you to publiſh with this Letter, but that ſome ingenious Friends adviſed me to the Contrary, alledging that 'twould be too great an Honour to ſuch a Groſs Piece of Scandal to give it a Formal Answer. For this Reaſon I've omitted them, and only depoſited a true and exact Copy of them (well atteſted) in the Hands of Mr. John Hodges, (one of our Bookſellers) where they may be ſeen for the Satisfaction of Mr. Shaw, or any other Perſon. But after all, as I am of Opinion that no Man of Candor and Ingenuity will give Credit to any thing like this of a Clergyman, ſo I am really perſwaded that even Mr. Shaw himſelf does not believe what he has here reported of me, unleſs he Meaſures My Capacities by his Own, and thinks me as Shallow as himſelf; however he ſaw it would add to the Number of his Hearſays, 'twould blacken an Enemy and that being a piece of Scandal, would oblige his Deluded Followers. Therefore, though we ſuppoſe him not to believe it, yet for point of Policy he [Cunning Man] could not omit it.

Seventhly and Laſtly. As to my Practice in Reſuſing to bury ſuch Perſons, as I am ſure were not Episcopally Baptiz'd. I have ſaid enough to juſtifie it in Remark 4th, and will not add more here upon that Article though 'twere eaſie, becauſe I won't prevent your Qualr Performance. And as to Inconſiſtency, in Believ^{ing} aſſertion herein, I can ſay, [I thank God] I have been

The Preface.



I *t is agreed on all Hands, both by the Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, and their Opponents in this Controversie, that the Dissenting Teachers in this Kingdom are no more than Lay-men. And the Reason is, because They have not been ordain'd by the Apostle's Successors, the Bishops, who alone, under Christ are vested with the Power of Ordination, so that all the Dispute is, whether the Mock-Baptisms, which are perform'd by Such Unauthoriz'd Persons, are Valid, or not.*

That they are Invalid for want of a Commission in the Administrator, has been abundantly made appear by many Learned Men.

The Right Reverend Dr. Taylor, late Bishop of Down, and Connor in Ireland, did many Tears ago express his Opinion in this Matter, and urg'd very Substantial Arguments to prove the Nullity of such Lay-Baptisms; and Dr. Forbes has written upon the same Subject, &c. And of late a very Worthy Gentleman, who was born of Dissenting Parents, but had the Happiness to see His Error, and was dissatisf'd as to that pretended Baptism He had receiv'd from a Dissenting Teacher, has, since his happy Conversion to the Church of England, procur'd the True Episcopal Baptism. And now at once to evince the great Satisfaction of his own Mind, in what He has suffer'd to be done, and to convince all others that are in the same Unhappy Circumstances, he formerly labour'd under, and to vindicate the practice of what

is Falſly call'd Rebaptization, which is only Baptiſm; He has wrote a Treatiſe upon the Subject, Entituled, Lay Baptiſm Invalid, in which he has convincingly prov'd, (as he promiſes in his Title Page,) that the Adminiſtrator is of the Eſſence of Baptiſm, as well as the Matter, and the Form, and conſequently ſince a Diſſenting Teacher, who is but a Layman, is not an Authoriz'd Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt; be-
 cauſe not truly Ordain'd, therefore he is not the Adminiſtrator of Baptiſm; Now this Propoſition He proves even to a Mathematical Demonſtration, and whatever Objections can be made againſt this Aſſertion, are fully, and clearly answer'd in the Appendix of his Book: So that I doubt not, any Man, who will lay aſide his Prejudice, Paſſion, and Intereſt, and will be Sincere in his Searches after Truth, will diſcover it in that moſt excellent Performance, and in the Reſt He has publiſh'd ſince in Vindication of it. Wherefore I have often wonder'd, that any Man pretending to Letters, after the Reading of thoſe incomparable Books, to which I add, the Learned Dr. Brett's Enquiry, &c. could ever prevail with himſelf to write in Oppoſition to that Principle.

But eſpecially how Surprizing is it to ſee ſome Right Reverend Biſhops, who are impow'erd to deliver Chriſt's Commiſſion arguing for the Validity of thoſe Acts which are done in Contempt of, and Affront to Epiſcopacy, and have not ſo much as Neceſſity to plead for 'em. With all due Deference and Submiſſion be it ſpoken, this Behaviour looks too like a Banter upon their own Order, and gives a very great Encouragement to the Uſurpers upon the Prieſthood, and the Authorities of ſuch Great Men are attended with very dreadful Conſequences,

Whether the Church has reap'd any real Advantage by this Conceſſion of Her Moderate Biſhops; whether the Diſſenters have come faſter into our Communion, ſince this Complement has been made 'em, is a Mat-

ter

ter that will very well admit of a Dispute.

But would it become me to speak freely my Sentiments on this Occasion, I should declare from my own Knowledge and Observation, that since this New Notion and Conceit of the Validity of Lay-Baptisms has been lately started, and these Lay-Ministrations have been by some great Men defended, the Inferences which have been made, are such, as I Charitably hope, Their Lordships do not approve of. For now the Baptism of the Episcopal Minister of the Parish is more disregarded and contemn'd, and if he strictly insists upon it, as the Rubrick does direct, that Children shall be brought to Church (if their be no Danger) to be Baptiz'd publicly, the Parents threaten to send for a Dissenting-Teacher to sprinkle them, in the Parents unlicens'd Houses, and affirm upon the Authority of some Bishops, that Baptism by whomsoever conferr'd is every whit as good and Valid, as that of a Lawful Episcopal Minister, and particularly since a certain Bishop declar'd publicly his Opinion, and urg'd, Quod fieri non debet, factum valet, &c. as an irrefragable Argument, one who before had all his Children baptiz'd at the Church would not suffer the next he had to be brought thither, but had it sprinkled by a Dissenting Teacher, and urg'd this Reason for it, that the Bishop had affirm'd his Baptism was as good as the Ministers of the Parish; and this Relation I had from the Minister himself of that Parish.

And 'tis further observable, that here, as well as at Oxford, and other Places, Children are carried publicly by the Midwife, or other Persons in great Form, and Order to the Conventicle to be sprinkled by a Layman, and when the Clergy, as it is their Duty, in their publick Preaching, or private Conferences, argue the Case with their seduc'd Parishioners, and prove the Nullity of their Lay-Teachers Ministrations; they seem to be taught to return
 †† 2 this

this Answer, that the Moderate Bishops are of another Opinion, and surely the Sons wont pretend to be wiser than their Fathers; nay, what the blessed Effects and consequences of this concession are, is notoriously evident from a late Pamphlet, call'd, The Validity of Baptism administred by Dissenting Ministers, written by a Nameless Author, who styles himself, A Presbyter of the Church of Christ, who is, as it is acknowledg'd Mr, Ferdinando Shaw, a Dissenting Teacher in Derby. In the mighty Performance, the Worthy Author labours hard to prove the Validity of those Mock-Baptisms perform'd by Him and His Brethren.

When I began first to peruse his Book, I expected to find some extraordinary Matter in it, viz. That He had made some secret Discoveries which were unknown before, and had met with some new Arguments, which were not urg'd by former Writers; nay, to speak plainly and seriously my Thoughts, I was apt to imagine He would have clearly and convincingly prov'd himself to be a Minister of Jesus Christ, and have shew'd his Commission, because he makes no scruple to stile himself in the Title Page.

A Presbyter. of the Church of Christ.

*And the Reason why I was so full of this Expectation was, because it was given out by His Party, and their Abettors in our own Communion, to be a Master-piece, and was written by the * Precious Mr. S—w, and had been deliver'd to his Hearers, and received with great Applause, at the Conventicle. Nay, such was His mighty Opinion of it, that He made it his Business to put it into the Hands not only of those of his own Perswasion, but of the † Moderate Low-Church Men, Free-Thinkers, La-*

ti-

** An Epithet his Followers gave him, to distinguish him from the Soul saving Mr. Moor, who being the Senior Teacher, our Author compar'd him to Elijah; and himself to Elisha, if his Hearers lie not.*

† So they are pleas'd to stile themselves.

ritudinarians, and like the Giant of Gath revived, he defied the Hosts of Israel, and desired it might be sent to the Clergy, to give 'em the Opportunity of Answering it, if they could. In short, it is thought by Himself, and his Friends Within Doors, and Without to be unanswerable. But

Parturiunt Montes Nascetur ridiculus Mus.

What did He worth a Gape so large produce?

The trav'ling Mountain yields a silly Mouse.

Creech,

For when I had read over and consider'd this great Work, I found, alas! my Expectation baffled, and disappointed; His reasoning is weak and unconvincive, and 'tis the serious Opinion of the Unprejudic'd, that it had been better to have confin'd His Harangue within the Walls of his Conventicle, and have amus'd only his deluded Followers by it, and not have expos'd it to the Light.

For if any Man considers the Title Page, and the Body of the Book, he will find the greatest Disparity imaginable, for in the former he promises to prove the Validity of His and His Brethren's Baptisms, as Ministers and Presbyters of the Church of Christ, but in the latter He does not prove that they are so, but is Modestly contented to place Himself and Them in the Form of Laymen, and as such endeavours all along to prove the Validity of Lay Baptism. Now the Arguments He urges for this purpose, He borrows chiefly from the Right Reverend the Bishops of S—m and O—d, whose Assertions, (for they are no more,) have been solidly confuted, by * the Ingenious Mr. L—, and the Learned Dr. Brett; so that it is highly disingenuous, and a gross Imposture to urge those Arguments, which have been substantially answer'd already. In those Passages and Expressions, which may properly be call'd His Own, it is very evident, He en-
dea-

* See Layman-Baptism invalid, Dissenter's Baptism Null and Void. Dr. Brett's Enquiry.

deavours by Suggestions, and Innuendo's, and sometimes by positive Charges to heighten the Prejudices of his Followers, and disaffect others against the Church, Clergy, and Liturgy, and fill them with dreadful Apprehensions of Popery, by which the Dissenters always include the Church of England.

In the latter Part of His Discourse, He demonstrates his particular Affection for the Clergy of this Country, by stigmatizing 'em with the Character of Uncharitable, Absurd, and Inconsistent, in Regard of their Agreement, not to read the Burial Office over Children who die Unbaptiz'd, and would fain make the World believe, (if positive Assertions will do it) that this Agreement is made only by a few Junior Clergymen, whereas 'tis very notorious, that the far greater Number have long Officiated in the Church, and are Seniors to our Author in more Senses than One: And however he may look down with an Air of Contempt and scorn upon them, there is none, but is equal to this Champion, and ready to cope with Him in any Part of Learning; how despicable soever they may seem, He knows what frequent Invitations he has had to friendly Debates and Conferences, and how often he has refus'd 'em, but for what Reason none knows better than Himself, tho' indeed 'tis no difficult Matter to guess it. And notwithstanding the Noise and Clamours which have been rais'd for Refusal of Burials, He knows that the Blame (if there be any) is chargeable upon his own Head; for if he would prove his Mission and Authority to Baptize, as he has been fairly invited to do, the Children had never been denyed the Office of Burial, so that the Dissenters have Just Reason to blame their own Teacher, and for ever to renounce Him, who cannot vindicate His own Acts, and Justifie His, and Their Practice of Separation.

The Book concludes with an Earnest Exhortati-
on

on to his Followers to continue stedfast in their Error, and not be frightned from their Profession, *i. e.* from their Schism, by the insignificant Threats of such as call the Dissenting Teachers no Ministers, and the Unbaptized no Christians, and to comfort their Hearts, He tells 'em, that in Case their Children should happen to die without Baptism, They have Reason enough to be easy, For the Child of a Christian Parent is a Christian as soon as it is born.

Page 22.

L, 5.

An Assertion this, so strange, so prodigious, so full of appearing Contradiction to the Divine Institution of Baptism, that it is most astonishing to hear, or to read it : To what Purpose then is Baptism administred, if a Child is a Christian without it.

But it seems the Saints, who are call'd the Elect, and all that belong to Them, have such Priviledges, that others can never pretend to. In short, I doubt not to make appear in the following Discourse, that our Author has affirm'd several Things, which, to say no worse, are downright Falshoods ; and some Stories He tells upon hearsay, (It is said, and I am inform'd, 'tis so, If I am not mistaken, and I am told this, and that,) and thus Scandal and Slander are propagated thro' the World, and Men's Reputations are less'n'd and destroy'd, and this is the Method the declar'd Adversaries of our Church have never fail'd to make use of, in order to extinguish the Authority of the Clergy, and Render 'em odious to the People, and then no Body will Regard what they say ; in which dirty Employment, they are too visibly assisted, by many of our own Communion. A Practice which as I detest, so I hope, I shall never be Guilty of, whatever Provocation I may Receive, and tho' I have to do with an Adversary, who has sufficiently express'd his Scorn of the Clergy, and by his Puritanic Fears demonstrated his Contempt of our Church, and Liturgy, yet however I will treat

Him

Him with Civility and good Manners, for I have no ill Will to His, or any Dissenter's Person, but only to their Errors, which are of the most dangerous Consequence, and as such They shall have no Compliment from me. If in a few Passages I presume to smile a little, and to be merry with Mr. S—w, He will pardon me in that Respect, because He takes the same Liberty, and aims at Wit.

And now if I be ask'd why these Sheets have not appear'd sooner, I have a very short but true Answer, that several Interruptions, and Accidents have hindred their Publication.

But since I observ'd my Reverend Brethren, so rudely insulted, and Represented as unable to answer this Famous Book, I resolv'd amidst all the hurry of Affairs, to take it into particular Consideration.

Now this I do with a more immediate Regard to those well meaning, but mistaken Persons whether of our own Communion, or the Dissenting Perswasion, who have no Opportunity to Read larger Volumes, and are apt to believe every Man to be an Authoriz'd Minister, that assumes that Title. And since I endeavour to be as short as the Nature of this Dispute will bear, I am oblig'd to omit many Observations, which I shall insert in the Defence of these Papers, if there be Occasion. And as I have fix'd a Resolution to do Nothing of Moment and Importance without making first an Appeal to Superior Judgments, so being happy in the Approbation, These following Sheets have met with, I submit them to the Candid Perusal of the Reader.



The Invalidity of the

LAY-BAPTISMS

O F

DISSENTING-TEACHERS, &c.

Every good Man must lament it as a very great Unhappiness; that in a Country blessed with so Glorious a Light of the Gospel as Ours is, there should be any so wilful, as to shut his Eyes against it, and reject the clearest Methods of Conviction.

And yet alas! how obvious is it to observe the mighty Industry some Men use to delude themselves and propagate Error in the World; Insomuch, that one would almost be tempted to believe they strive which shall recommend himself best, by serving the Devil's Cause, and promoting the Works of Darkness; under pretence of *Free-thinking*, a Latitude in Religion is introduc'd to undermine Christianity, and settle Men in *Atheism*; and to this End, many Books (the worst and vilest, that ever blasted a Christian's Eye,) have been printed and dispers'd thro' the Nation; In these the most Sacred Rites, and Mysteries of our Holy Religion are shamefully ridicul'd; the sacred Scriptures scandalously burlesqu'd; the Priesthood expos'd as insignificant, and the Miracles wrought

wrought by the mighty Power of God, are made the Subject Matter of their profane, false Wit, and impious Drollery. And as there are no Endeavours wanting to draw in Profelytes to their horrid *Self*, so the Difficulty is not great; for when Men are debauch'd in their Lives already, or having a willing Mind to be so, what Wonder is it that they strike in with these *New Notions*, and suit vile Principles, with a viler Practice. And if one were to ask the *New Converts* to what they ow'd their Conviction, the true Answer must be this, that whilst they believed the Truth of the Christian Religion, they could never, with any quiet, indulge their Lusts; and therefore the Transition to a *Self* which disregards the Precepts of Christianity, and allows its Professors to be as Wicked as they please, is very easy. But besides the Advantage it has received from Immorality; The Divisions among those who call themselves Christians, have not a little contributed to its growth; here the *Romanists* add new Doctrines to Christianity, and there the *Arians* and *Socinians*, and other *Hetericks* detract from it, nay, those who pretend to the same Faith with us have yet imbib'd *Latitudinarian* Principles, quarrel with the Constitutions of the Church, and by causeless *Schisms*, and unwarrantable Separations rend the Body of Christ, and disturb the Peace of the Kingdom, and thus the Minds of *Some* have been bewildred and distracted in their Searches after Truth; which, when they could not possibly find, out of the Pale of the Church, like fatigu'd Travellers, they sit down at last in *Scepticism*, *Irreligion*, and *Infidelity*. But that there is such a Thing as Truth, is certain and unquestionable, and that here It can be found only in the Communion of the Establish'd Church of *England* is demonstrable, for Her Doctrines and Government by Bishops are groundd upon

upon the Scriptures, and recommended by the best Antiquity; *Her* Liturgy is mostly collected from the Word of God, and the antient Liturgies, *Her* Ceremonies (few as they are) are truly Primitive, so that in this Communion there is every Thing that is necessary and conducive to our Eternal Salvation, and if Men firmly adhere to it, and live as they are Taught, there is not the least Room to doubt of their Happiness. And tho' this Church is, I verily believe, the best constituted Church, in the World, as it is the most Primitive, and Apostolical; yet how notoriously is it attack'd on all Sides by its false Friends *Within*, and declar'd Enemies *Without*. The Doctrines, particularly that of the *Blessed Trinity*, and Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, and the *Holy Ghost* is flatly deny'd by some, and distinguish'd away by others. Episcopacy, or the Government of the Church by Bishops is affirm'd to be a humane Institution. Only, alterable at the pleasure of the Civil Government, the Independency of the Church on the State, as to *Her* purely Spiritual Powers (*viz.* *Ordination*, *Administration of the Blessed Sacraments*, *Excommunication*, *Absolution*,) is decry'd as *Savouring of Popery*. The Doctrine of the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper* being a Figurative or Commemorative Sacrifice, is represented as an Inconsistency. The *Sacerdotal Power* of *Absolution*, as maintain'd by the Church of *England*, and vastly different from that of *Rome* is yet declar'd to be agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and 'tis ask'd, where does our Church teach it, or require it in any of *Her* Offices. And tho' the *Priesthood*, *Ordination*, and *Sacraments* are in this Age made a publick Jest, and blasphemously ridicul'd by the Author of the *Rights*; and the rest of his execrable *Sett*, yet the Assertion of the Invalidity and

Nullity of Baptism administered by a Lay Hand, is by Some call'd a Conceit, and a Notion lately started, and then by unwarrantable Concessions, and a Mistaken Charity, the profane Scoffers of Religion become more Insolent; and the erroneous are more confirm'd in their Schism. Among many Instances which might be given, witness Mr. S—, I am at present concern'd with, what a mighty Stress does He lay upon the Opinions, of two Right Reverend Bishops of our Church, which favour his Lay Administrations; and yet see the Remarkable Disingenuity of this Transcriber, for whatever their Lordships have elsewhere observ'd which is against Him, and a Condemnation of the Schism the Dissenters are most flamingly guilty of, He cunningly passes by, and takes no Notice of it. But to refresh his Memory, and to shew the World the Disingenuity, and partiality of this Gentleman, I have added by Way of Appendix Number the 1st the Opinions of these very Bishops in Relation to the Dissenter's Schism, which is well worth the Reader's Observation; So that if Mr. S— will take their Opinions in one Case, let him give a good Reason why he does not in another.

But because Mr. S— may think himself neglected, (which would doubtless be a very great Mortification,) if his Mighty Work be not taken Notice of, I shall therefore make a particular Examination of it, as my Affairs, and time will permit.

In the first Paragraph He observes, that the pretended Baptisms administered by Himself, and His Brethren are condemn'd and Invalid, which is a Charge I grant is very true, and the Reasons shall be shewed.

But now here it were natural to expect that He would have clearly prov'd his Commission to Baptize

Baptize, as an *Authoriz'd Minister of Jesus Christ*. Who could ever have doubted, but He would have us'd his utmost Endeavours to shew from *Scripture* and *Antiquity*, the Validity of *Presbyterian Ordination*, and in Consequence of that the Validity of *His Mock-Baptisms*? But if you look for any *One* Text of *Scripture* for that Purpose, or any *One* Quotation out of the *Antient Fathers*, to countenance Him, you will be *Extremely* mistaken; He only mentions a *Few Tracks* in the Margin, written by *Dissenting Teachers*, who are *Equally* Guilty with Him of *Cavalier Sin*; and what *Wonder* is it, That, *Thesa*, (like *Demetrius*, and the Makers of the *Silver Shrines for Diana*,) should endeavour to support *Their Craft*. And yet even *Those* very Books have been *Substantially* answer'd, and whatever Arguments were *there* offer'd, (which indeed are but the same which their Forefathers formerly urg'd) have been *Seriously* consider'd, and *Solidly* confuted by the *Learned Writers of the Church of England*; and we have a *clear Account* what the *Primitive Episcopacy* was, viz: *Diocesan* as it now stands in the *Church of England*. So that this Paragraph is sufficiently answer'd, by setting down, as our Author does, a Catalogue of Books writn by the *Dead and Living*, which manifestly proves that Bishops always Govern'd, and Ordain'd in the *Christian Church*, and that *Presbyterian Ordination* is Null, and Void. * But above all, I more especially mention an old Book written in *Greek*, above 16 Hundred Years ago in the *Apostolick Age*, by that blessed Martyr *St. Ignatius*, who convers'd with the Apostles themselves, and was Bishop of *Antioch Himself*, and suffer'd Martyrdom at *Rome* for

* Bp. Hall of Episcopacy. Vindication of the Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*. Divine Right of Episcopacy recommended by Dr. Hicks. Dr. Potter of church government. Dr. Well's Letters and Theses.

for the Christian Religion which we profess, and Surely, He must know much better than any Presbyterian of them all, whether *Episcopacy*, or *Presbytery* was the Instituted Government of *Christ's Church*. And that he is on our Side of the Question, and directly against the *Dissenters*, is most evident, as Mr. S— may perhaps discover by the Help of his *Lexicon*, and the Assistance of his more Learned Friends.

For in those seven genuine Epistles, he wrote and left as a Legacy to the Churches. He expressly mentions the three distinct Orders of *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, and affirms That that is no Church, nor cannot properly be call'd so, that is without a Bishop, and that no Man can Baptize without Authority, and Commission from the Bishop. What then must we think of the *Dissenting Congregations* which are gather'd; and the Ministrations of *Dissenting Teachers*, which are perform'd in Opposition to *Episcopacy*? If therefore our Author cannot produce better Authorities than those in his Margin, if he cannot prove his Mission from *Scripture* and *Antiquity*, as I am confident he cannot; 'Tis to be strongly presumed, nay, 'tis most certain that He is but a *Layman*, and consequently His Baptisms are unauthoriz'd, and no other than *Lay Baptisms*, which come now to be considered.

To prove *Lay-Baptism* to be *Valid*, it is again Observable Page 2. That He does not quote One Text of Scripture, nor so much as a single Passage out of any of the *Antient Fathers*. I charitably hope He knew, or at least vehemently suspected, That neither Scripture nor Antiquity would be of any Service, and therefore calls some Passages out of the Writings of two *Modern Fathers*, The Rt. Rev. the Bishops of S—m and O—d; and because they are pleas'd to affirm, that *Presbyterian-Lay-Baptism* is *Valid*, Ergo it is so. Now tho' I have

a great Deference, and Respect for those Persons, who are vested with the *Episcopal Power*, yet I am loth to be a Loser by my Reverence, or be in an Error out of *Complaisance*, to Men in High Stations.

But if the Authorities of *these Learned Prelates* amount to an Argument, they may be balanced by the Authorities of others at least *Equally Learned*, who are of quite different Sentiments from their Lordships? If therefore *Lay-Baptism* be *Valid*, as Mr. S——w says it is, because the Bishops of S——m and O——d affirm so, then say I, it is *Invalid* because many more Bishops and Divines say it is so.

Bishop Taylor speaking of *Lay-Baptism*, particularly those performed by Midwives as the practice has been formerly, has these *Memorable Words*. *

' In all Moral Actions, there must be a substantial
' Poteſtative Principle, that must have proportion'd Power
' to the Effect; a thing cannot be done without a Cause
' and Principle in Morality, any more than in Nature.
' If a Woman goes about to consecrate the Holy Sacra-
' ment, it is an ineffective Hand, She Sins for Attempting
' it. And it were wiser and truer if Men would think
' the same thing of their giving Baptism, unless they will
' confess, that to Baptize Children is a mere natural and
' secular Action to which natural Powers are sufficient,
' or that Women have received Spiritual Powers to do it,
' and that whether a Priest or Woman does it, is no
' difference but matter of order only. If an Effect be
' Spiritual, the Agent must be so too, and again the
' same Learned Bishop tells us† this Custom came in
' at a wrong Door, it leaned upon a false, and super-
' stitious Opinion, and they thought it better to in-
' vade the Priest's Office, than to trust God with
' their

* Ductor Dubitantium, P. 198. Edition 4th.

† See for both these Quotations, P. 198. 638; 639. of Ductor Dubitantium.

their Souls; which He made with his own Hands,
 and redeemed with his Son's Blood, but this Custom
 was not to be follow'd, if it had still continu'd; for-
 even then they confess'd it was Sin, Factum valet, si-
 cri non debuit; and Evil ought not to be done for a
 good End, &c. This Custom therefore is of the Na-
 ture of those which are to be laid aside: No Man
 Baptizes but he that is in Holy Orders, said
 Simeon of Thessalonica; and I think he said truly.
 But above all things, Opinions are not to be taken,
 up by Custom, and reduc'd to Practice, not only because
 Custom is no good Warranty for Opinions, &c. But
 besides this, when an Opinion is offer'd only by the
 Hand of Custom, it is commonly a sign of a bad Cause,
 and that there is nothing else to be said for it.

Dr. Beveridge late Bishop of St. Asaph was of
 Opinion, that no Acts of the Ministry are valid,
 which are done without a Commission, as appears
 from his own Words, which follow. 'If I did
 not think, or rather was not fully assur'd, that I
 had such a Commission, to be an Ambassador for
 Christ, and to act in his Name, I should never
 think it worth my while to Preach or execute,
 my Ministerial Office, for I am sure all that I did,
 would be Null and Void of it self, according to
 God's ordinary Way of Working, and we have no
 ground to expect Miracles. * To these I may add
 the Learned Dr. Hickes, Dr. Forbes, Mr. Lesley, and
 Dr. Brett who have all written, more or less, against
 the Validity of Lay-Baptisms; The last has very late-
 ly shewn in his Enquiries, &c. That the primitive
 Church in general; neither approv'd, nor practic'd
 'em, on the contrary condemn'd 'em, and it ought to
 be remark'd, that what the Learned and Reverend
 Mr. Bingham pleads for, is that some particular
 Churches allow'd of Lay-Baptisms, in cases of ex-
 treme

* See Bp. Beveridge's Sermon on this Text, *Now we are
 Ambassadors for Christ*, &c., P. 386.

treme Necessity, which we all know, is not our *Dissenter's* Case, for Baptism is offer'd *Them*, but *They* reject it. I might here mention several of our present Bishops, whose Opinions are vastly Different from their Lordships in this Case, as well as others; and I can tell Mr. Shaw, that it is *commonly reported*, that when some *Moderate* Bishops offer'd the Declaration in Favour of *Lay Baptism*, to the late Arch-Bishop of York, to be subscribed by him; He, like a truly Primitive Bishop, refus'd it. And as for those Bishops mentioned, as Arch-Bishop *Wharfigi*, &c. who were all great Men in the Church: Some of them allow'd of *Lay Baptism* only in Cases of Necessity, as for Instance, Bishop *Bancroft* and Bishop *Bilson*, which, as I have said, is not the *Dissenter's* Case, for they cannot plead Necessity. What the blessed *Ignatius* says, in Reference to this Matter, is so remarkable, I cannot but repeat it, *without the Bishop, it is not Lawful to Baptize*. Now he was no *Junior Clergyman*, as I am, but was a venerable ancient Bishop; He was so sincere, that I believe he always spoke without reserves, and honestly express'd his real Sentiments. In a Word, if a just Computation were made, I am very much inclined to believe it would appear, that the greater Number, perhaps three Parts in four of the *English Clergy* maintain the Invalidity of *Lay Baptisms*, and some as considerable as any of the Parochial Clergy, have declar'd against the Validity of such pretended Baptisms both in Print, (as Mr. *Bennett* and Mr. *Reaves*,) and in the Pulpit also, of which very many Instances might be given. So that the short of the Matter is this; that as some particular Bishops, and Divines, have deliver'd their private Judgments, and Opinions for *Lay Baptism*, so other Bishops and Divines, and many more in Number,

B

have

have declared against it. And as the Opinions of the former are inconsistent with, and directly contrary to the fix'd, and establish'd Judgment of the Church of England, (as shall by and by be shew'd,) they are therefore of no Weight, or Moment at all, but the Opinions of the latter, which are consistent with, and agreeable to, the Doctrine of our Church, are to be preferred, and relyed on; because, they are supported by the *Articles, Rubrick, and Canons* of our *Ecclesiastical Constitution*. But to go a little farther; according to this Gentleman's Way of Arguing from the Opinion of this, or that great Man, one may make Error to be Truth, and Truth Error, or according to *Bellarmines* Expression, Virtue shall be Vice, and Vice Virtue. And thus the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* and *Non-Resistance*, which is, a Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and of the Church of England, was (it seems) true, when *Dr. Burnet* maintain'd it in his Sermon at *Covenant-Garden Church, London*; but is now False, and a slavish Tenet, because the Bishop of *S---*, has alter'd his Opinion; *

Tempora mutantur, Et nos mutamur in illis.

So that according to this Rate of Reasoning, which shews Mr. *S---*'s great Skill in Logick, one may prove any Opinion, or Practice to be true, and lawful, because as it has been affirm'd, there is no Opinion so monstrous, and Wicked, but some Body has espous'd it, there is no Villainy but some have practis'd it.

But since our Author is so mighty fond of the Opinions of Bishops, when they make for him, and makes *Them* his *only* Argument, I will refresh his Memory with some Authorities, which perhaps he would be glad to have conceal'd, and could heartily wish they had not been found. How much

* See Dr. Burnet's Sermon beforementioned, and the Bp. of *S---*'s Speech, at the Tryal of that Reverend and worthy Gentleman, Dr. *Sacheverell*, to whom every Churchman owes

much soever the *Dissenters* pretended to admire Mr. *Calvin*, and the Reformed abroad, the Assembly of Divines (as it was call'd,) and their Followers here, and the *Kirk* in *Scotland*, 'tis very evident, that this Notion of the Validity of *Lay-Baptism* contradicts them all,

* Mr. *John Quick* a *Dissenting Teacher*, in the Introduction to his *Synodicon*, in *Gallia Reformatâ*, collected; and compos'd out of Original Manuscript Acts of the *French Protestant Synods* Page VI. Sect. IX. tells us that their first National Synod was celebrated in the City of *Paris*, and Year of our Lord, 1559, in Chap. XI. Page Xlii, under the Title of *Baptism* there is this Remarkable Canon.

Canon I. Baptism administr'd by an *unordain'd Person* is wholly *Void* and *Null*.

The second National Synod held at *Peitriers*, *An.* 1560, Vol. 1. Chap. 6. Article 21. Page 81 says,

What is to be done in Case a Child has been Baptized by a *Private Person*? Its answer'd, that to avoid the Scandal given, and taken, there shall be Sermons preach'd for the better Information of the People, who shall also be acquainted with the *Necessity* of such Baptisms; and that this may be *imprinted* upon their Hearts, the Child shall be brought publickly into the Church, there to receive the *True Baptism*.

Monsieur *Le Baillet* President.
Monsieur *Roland* Scribe.

The Brethren of *Geneva's Answer* to a *Letter* concerning *Lay-Baptism*.

Article 1.

WE Ministers and Doctors in the Church of *Geneva*, accompanied with our Brethren
B 2 some

* See Mr. *Quick's Synodicon*, or the Judgment of the Reformed concerning *Lay-Baptism*.

come from the National Synod of *Lyons*, being met together in the Name of God, after that we had heard that Case of Conscience propounded to us, *Whether Baptism administred by private Persons, without Office in the Church of God, ought to be reiterated, or not*; did unanimously declare this our Judgment, that such Baptism did not in any wise agree with the Institution of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and therefore consequently is of no Force, Power, Validity, or Effect, and that the Child ought to be brought to the Church of God, there to be Baptized: For to separate the Ministrations of the Sacraments from the Pastor's Office; 'tis as, if one should tear out a Seal to make use of, it without the Commission, or Letters Patents to which it was affix'd. And in this Case we must practice that Rule of our Lord, *What God hath join'd together, let no Man put asunder*. This for and in the Name of all the Assembly.

JOHN CALVIN.

Again, *Article 3d*

GOD has told us by his Son's own Word, who the Persons are that shall administer Baptism.

Article 5th.

[*Lay-Baptism*] is a Counterfeit Baptism, a meer Mockery, a Profanation of the Sacrament; to whose first Institution we must strictly keep. We do not reiterate Baptism, for the pretended Baptism is, utterly *Unlawful*, yea, wholly *Null* — In short, either Baptism is unprofitable, and appointed to no Purpose, or else it must be observ'd according to its *Primitive Institution*.

Article 6th.

Let no one administer it, who hath no Call from God to do it, 'tis all one as if an *Apoc.* as he that hath

hath no Commission to preach the Gospel did administer it.

Article 8th.

We never did confess that the bare sprinkling of Water by one without a Call, or Office, in the Church of God was Baptism, or that it had its *Evangelical* Form there, where there was no *Evangelical* Minister.

Article 9th.

We repute as *Null*, and *Void* this spurious Baptism by *private* and *uncommissionated* Persons. And altho' We do not tie up the *Grace of God* to the Hand of a poor Man; yet notwithstanding that, Baptism must be annexed unto his Quality, or else the Authority of Jesus Christ must be trampled under Foot.

Article 11th.

The Lord Jesus hath not rejected this *Sacrament*, nor wholly abandon'd it to be dispensed by all sorts of Persons whatsoever; but he hath deposited a Commission with his Ministers, who are to dispense it.

Article 12th.

When as a private Person poureth Water, we deny that this is that formal Baptism, which was by our Lord Jesus. Moreover let this be noted by the Way, that when the *Israelites*, and *Edomites* cut themselves off from the Church, tho' they retain'd *Circumcision*, yet they did but profane it, and 'twas none other than a piece of Juggling, for God accounted those Nations as *Uncircumcised*.

Article 13th.

This Imaginary Baptism doth not in the least signify, or Seal our new Birth.

Article

Article 14th.

If a *private Person* who hath no Call from God, shall of his own Will and Fancy usurp that Office, which doth not belong unto him, his Baptism is but a meer Piece of Farcery, and therefore Null.

Article 16th.

We deny — That the Hand and Sign, of our Lord *Jesus Christ* will be own'd in the sprinkling of Water by a Person *Uncall'd* and *Uncommissiōned* by him.

Article 19th.

We say, that *Papish* Baptism is grounded upon the Institution of Christ, because the Priests as perverse as they are, and totally corrupt, are yet the ordinary Ministers of that Church.

Article — The Word Rebaptize is misapplied, sith it was never question'd but that such an *Apish* Trick as this *Mock-Baptism* might be reform'd.

Peter Kirrett.

President of the Council.

The first Synod of Rochel, 1571.

Theodore de Beza, Minister of Geneva was Moderator.

N. des Gallars, and *Dela Rongeraye* Scribes.

In Chap. 7. Article, 19. Page 97. Says; that Baptism administr'd by a Person, who hath neither Call nor Commission, is wholly Null and Void.

The Synod of Gap in the Year 1603.

Where *Monsieur Channier* was President, Mr. *Ferriss* Assessor, *Monsieur Vignier* and *Monsieur Roy* Scribes, Page 225 of *Synodicon*, Vol. 1.

In the 6th. Chap. Sect. 12 Page 239. Says, This Case was propounded, A Proposant (i.e. a Candidate for Orders) never call'd, nor ordain'd unto the Ministry, takes upon him to Baptize a Child.

Is

Is this Baptism *Valid*? This *Synod* judgeth, that the Scandal given unto the People be carefully taken away, and forasmuch as that Baptism is of no Force, the Child shall be brought into the Church of God by true Baptism, according to the Decision of the *Synod of Poitiers*.

The Third *Synod* of *Rochel* in the Year, 1607.

Monsieur Berant Moderator.

Monsieur Merlin Assessor.

Monsieur Andrew Rivet and

Monsieur Roy, Scribes.

Vol. 1. Chap. 1. Page 261, says in Chap. 5. Sect. 18. Page 272. The Deputies of *Lower Languedoc* mov'd this Case, whether Persons having a long time profess'd the true Religion, and coming to understand they were Baptiz'd only by a *Midwife*, ought to be *Rebaptized*? This Assembly judgeth, that they ought to be publicly Baptiz'd in the Church of Christ, according to the Institution of our Lord, by a *Lawful Minister*, their former Baptism being wholly Null and Void, because done by One, who had no Call unto that Office. So that by what I have here quoted, the Reader may clearly see, that the Reformed abroad have, from time to time, declar'd, in their National *Synods*, all Baptisms to be Null and Void, which are not perform'd by a *Lawful Minister*, by One who is truly Sent, and Ordain'd. They call'd such Baptisms, (a *Mackery*, a *Farce*, an *Act* of Baptisms, and *Mock-Baptisms*, so that is to assert *Lay-Baptism* to be *Invalid*, be *Uncharitable*, the Reform'd are as *Uncharitable*, as I or any of my Principle, for 'tis very evident, that they do not think That to be *Christian* Baptism, which is administred by an *uncommission'd Layband*, wherefore Mr. *Shaw's*, and others Defences of *Lay-Baptisms* are a flat and palpable Contradiction to the publick Acts of those very Reform'd

Reform'd, for whom they pretend to have so great a Respect, and Veneration. Our Author's *New-Notion* of the Validity of *Lay-Baptism* condemns the Determination of his *Presbyterian-Ancestors*, for the Assembly of Divines, (as they were called,) allow'd no Baptism to be *Valid*, that was not perform'd by a *Lawful Minister*, as will appear from their *Directory* and *Confession of Faith*. And Mr. *Tho. Edwards* Author of the *Gangrana*, or *Catalogue of Errors*, &c. who was an Eminent and Rigid *Presbyterian-Teacher*, and gives us an Account of the many *Heresies*, and *Schisms* which sprung up after the Church of *England*, was by *Fanatick Moderation*, laid in the Dust. He, I say, in that Book, Page 24. reckons it to be an *Error*, and true *Anabaptism* for any to affirm, (as it seems some then did, as well as now.) that '*Baptizing belongs not to Ministers only, All Gifted, and Preaching Disciples, (tho' no Ministers) may Baptize*, Error 106. '*Baptizedness* is not '*Essential to the Baptizer, nor Essential to Preaching*; so that Persons not only not 'in Office, but 'not so much as Baptized, may both Baptize, and *Preach, Error 107. So that here again, you see, what Mr. *Shaw* with his borrowed Quotations so strenuously pleads for, was condemned by his Forefather *Edwards*, as a monstrous and abominable Error. His Assertions are also contradictory to the old Mother of the *Presbyterians*, the *Holy Kirk* of *Scotland*, so that I cannot help thinking, and saying too, that 'He is a very undutiful Son. But to be serious; the *Kirk* declares in the *Confession of Faith*, that Baptism must be performed, in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, by a Minister Lawfully Ordained, see Article 27. *

From what has been said, it plainly appears, that

* The Abstract may be seen in the present State of Great Britain, P. 438.

that the Judgment of Mr. Calvin, and the Re-
form'd the *Presbyterians* of Old, and the *Kirk* of
Scotland at this very Day, is with the Defenders
of the *Invalidity* of *Lay-Baptism* in this particular,
and that Mr. S—— is gone off quite from *Pres-*
byterian Principles, and run into a strange *Degeneracy*,
so that the Matter is come to this, that he must
prove himself, if he can, to be no *Layman*, but a
Lawful and *True Authoriz'd Minister*, or else his
pretended Baptisms, and all other his *Ministrations*
are *Null* and *Void*, by the *Confession*, and avow'd
Declaration of the before-mention'd *Synods*, and
others of his own *Perswasion*. Now whether he
has offer'd one *Argument* to prove his *Mission*, I
appeal to every *honest*, and *unprejudic'd Reader*; and
therefore since he does not so much as Attempt
it, there is no Occasion for me to enter now upon
the *Discussion* of that Point. A Point which has
been so very well manag'd by the *Authors* I
have already mention'd, that he that reads any
of them without prejudice, must be convinc'd,
that a *Dissenting Teacher* is no commission'd *Mini-*
ster of Jesus Christ, but a *Corabite*, i. e. a *Usurper*
upon the *Priesthood*. But if any be desirous to see
this Charge clearly made out in a narrow Com-
pass, I recommend to all *Dissenters*, and others, A
Sermon. Price Three pence. Entituled, *God's Call*
of his Ministers, Preach'd at *St. Mary's White Chap-*
pel, *London*, by *Mr. William Richardson*, a Con-
vert to the Church of *England*: He was lately a
Dissenting Preacher in *Pinemaker's Hall*, and *St. John*
Clerkenwell, but now *Canonically* ordain'd a *Presbyter*
of the Church of *England*. In this *Sermon* the Re-
verend Author, very clearly proves the *Nullity* of
that *Presbyterian Ordination* he had formerly receiv'd:
But till the Reader can furnish himself with that
Sermon, or other Books upon that Subject, in hopes of
con-

confirming those who are in the Communion of the Church, and of convincing such as are in *Schism*, I will prove as briefly as I can, that Mr. S——, and his Brethren, (*Dissenting Teachers*) are, (as the *Synods* of the Reform'd express it,) only *private Persons*, i. e. *no Ministers of Christ*; and that the *Dissenting* Congregations are not Churches, because they have not an *Episcopal Administrator* of Ministerial Acts in them.

It justly deserves our Observation, that in the *Jewish Church*, (which all allow was of Divine Institution,) there were these three Distinct Orders, the *High-Priest*, *Priests*, and *Levites*, to which Form of Government, our *Blessed Lord* himself conform'd as much as possible in the Institution of the *Christian Church*, and tis answer'd by those three Orders, viz. *Diocesan Bishop*, his *Priests* and *Deacons*. Whilst our *Saviour* convers'd with Men upon Earth, He was the *chief Shepherd*, and *Bishop of our Souls*, and is expressly stil'd so. He is also call'd, the *High-Priest of our Profession*, and an *High-Priest call'd of God*. So that He may very properly be said to be, the *First Bishop*, or *Governour* in the *Christian Church*. That this *Episcopacy* thus begun in Himself, (and therefore of divine Institution in the Primary, and highest Sense) might continue after his Ascension into Heaven, He calls twelve *Apostles*, after the Number of the twelve *Tribes*, and after them seventy others, according to the like Number in the *Sanhedrim* of the *Jews*,* or according to the like Number of the Heads of Families in the *Literal Israel*, who were appointed according to the Number of *Jacob's Children* who went with him into *Egypt*. which 70 were inferior to the twelve, as is evident from hence, because

* According to Dr. Potter and others. So says *Grotius*.

cause these two Orders are *dist'nguish'd* from one another, which is an Evidence of the Distinction of their Office. Besides it is very remarkable, that whenever there was a Vacancy in the *Apostolate* by the Death of any of the *Apostles*, an Election was made of one of the second and lower Order to fill it. And as it was foretold of *Judas*, that his *Habitation should be desolate, and no Man should dwell therein*, but his *Bishoprick* should another take. * So *Matthias* who was one of the 70 was chosen to succeed him, and was numbred among the 11 *Apostles*. Now 'tis certain he was by this Election rais'd to an higher Office in the Church, otherwise it would have been no Advancement to succeed him. *St. James* was succeeded at *Jerusalem* by *Simeon Son of Cleophas*, *St. Paul* at *Cæsarea* by *Philip*, - *St. Peter* at *Rome* by *Clement*, and many others of the Seventy, succeeded the *Apostles* in the Government of Their Churches, after they were dead, as appears more at large in *Dorotheus* Bilhop of *Tyrus* his Account of the Seventy Disciples, which he wrote in *Greek* above a thousand Years ago. For that their might be a constant Succession in the Church, our *Blessed Lord* took care to invest the *Apostles* with the *Episcopal Power of Ordination*, for as He had, in the first place, ordain'd them *Deacons*, when † He chose them to be *with Him*, as his Attendants and Ministers, and to *preach the Gospel*, and to *Baptize* too, for our *Saviour* Baptiz'd not, but his Disciples; ‖ As He had authoriz'd Them to act as His *Priests*, and to administer the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, when He commanded them to do as he had done, i. e. to bless the Elements of *Bread and Wine* in Remembrance of Him; (which is the Office of the *Priest*, or *Presbyter*, who is of the second Order of

C 2

Ministers

* St. Mark 3. v. 14. † St. John 4. v. 1. 2. ‖ St. Matt. 28 v. 29.

Ministers,) So, He ordain'd them to be *Bishops*, and *Governours* of His Church, after his Departure, and this he did a little before his Ascension into Heaven. *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you, i. e.* As God the Father had commission'd Him to govern and ordain, so he Authoriz'd them to govern in his Absence, & to ordain others to succeed Them, as They did Him, and so on to the end of the World; *For so, I am with you, and your Successors, in your, and their Ministrations to the End of the World.* * And accordingly, in pursuance of this Commission, they ordain'd, for the Service of the Church † Seven *Deacons*, who were set before them, or presented to them by the Disciples, or 108 *Presbyters*, so that hence it appears, that there were in the time of the *Apostles*, even from the Beginning of Christianity, three distinct Orders of Church-Officers, viz. The twelve *Apostles*, the seventy *Disciples*, and the seven *Deacons*.

That the *Apostles* did ordain *Bishops* (as we now stile them) in all the Churches they establish'd, to preside over, and govern both the *Clergy* and *Laity*, and to ordain Ministers to Officiate for the People, is most evident from the Holy Scriptures, and the best and purest Antiquity. From the former it is abundantly manifest, that St. Paul (who was not of the Number of the Twelve, but was afterwards by an immediate Call, elected into the *Apostolate*;) He, I say, constituted Timothy [a single Person] of the Order of the Seventy, according to *Dorotheus*, to be Bishop of Ephesus, and vested Him with *Episcopal* Authority, and Jurisdiction, which he advises him to exercise; for so, 1. *Tim.* 1. Ch. 3. v. *I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some, that they teach no other Doctrine than what is accord-*
ing

* So Dr. Lightfoots Conjectures. † Acts 6. v. 2. &c.

ing to Godliness, or had been deliver'd by Christ, and His Apostles.

In the 34. ch. He acquaints him what the Qualifications ought to be, of those who offer themselves for Ordination, and requires him V. 12. to advance those Deacons that have used their Office well, because they purchase to themselves a good Degree, i. e. They deserve to be made Presbyters and Bishops. *

Again, In the 1. Ep. 5. Ch. 17. V. 2c. He is charged to take care, that such of his Presbyters, as were painful in the work of the Ministry, should be the more Respected, and more Liberally provided for; Let the Elders that Rule well, be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who Labour in the Word and Doctrine; for the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the Mouth of the Ox that treadeth out of the Corn. And then with Respect to the Censures of his Clergy, he is caution'd V. 19. not to be too apt to believe every ill Report of 'em, but to expect clear Evidence. Against an Elder receive not an Accusation, but before two or three Witnesses. V. 20. Them that Sin Rebuke before all, that others also may fear, doing Nothing by Partiality, and then lastly speaking of Ordination.

V. 22, The Apostles Advises him, To lay Hands suddenly on no Man, neither be partaker of other Men's Sins. In all which Instances, 'tis abundantly manifest, that Timothy was vested with an Episcopal Authority

* The Learned Commentators upon the Bible understand this Text in this Sense. Grætius, Esnius, Menestius, Vossius, Scultetus, Pricæus.

Dr. Whitby upon the Place, says, it was the Custom to choose Presbyters out of the Deacons, and Bishops out of the best Presbyters, and therefore at the Ordination of a Deacon they prayed, that he using the Office of a Deacon unblameably, might be held worthy of an higher Honour.

Authority over the whole Church of *Ephesus*; for had he been no more than a *Presbyter*, or *Priest*, how could he exert Authority over his *Equals*? But since, as has been shew'd, he acted as a Superior; and tho' he was a single Person, yet had a Power to ordain; and to Judge of the Qualifications of the Candidates for Holy Orders, and to admit, or reject 'em, as he found 'em fit, or not fit, to inflict *Ecclesiastical* Censure upon 'em, for any disorderly Practices; What *better Evidence*, I may say, *Demonstration* can be given, to prove, that *Timothy* was a *Bishop*, according to the present Acceptation of that Word.

That *Titus* had an *Episcopal* Power in that large and populous Island of *Creet*, (now *Candia*) in which were an hundred Cities * is plain from *St. Paul's* own Words, *Titus* 1. Ch: 5. V. Where we are told, the Reason why the Apostle fix'd him there as an *Arch-Bishop*, and *Metropolitan* of a Province; for this Cause left I thee in *Creet*, that thou shouldest set in Order the things that are wanting, and Ordain Elders, i. e. Ministers in every City as I had appointed thee, And V. 11. He charges him to stop the Mouths of many *Vain Talkers*, and *false Teachers*, who spoke things which they ought not, for filthy *Lucre's* Sake, i. e. for what their injudicious Hearers, and deluded Followers would be pleas'd to give 'em; A Practice continu'd still by the *Sectaries*, as may be illustrated in a great many Instances, too numerous here to be inserted.

In the 3. Ch. the Apostle gives him Instructions how to deal with such as disturb the Peace of the Church, by corrupting the Christian Faith, and
broach-

* Therefore call'd the Island with the hundred Cities.

broaching false and Heterodox Opinions; *An * Heretick after the First and Second Admonition reject. i. e.* When a Man continues obstinate in his Error, and Opposition to the Church, let his Conversation be avoided, as much as possible, let no Familiarity and Intimacy be contracted with him, † suffer him not to remain in the outward Communion of the Church, || Excommunicate him till he repent, ¶ so that here is you see, as full a Demonstration as can be wish'd for, of an *Episcopal Power*, lodg'd in the single Person of *Titus*, and not in a Class of the *Presbyters*, according to the Modern Novel Scheme of the *Presbyterians*. Now if the Ministers, or *Presbyters* who were in *Creet* before, instructing the People, had had the Power of Ordination, and governing that Church as *Presbyters*, as the *Presbyterian* Sectaries contend, Then I ask what occasion there was, for *St. Paul* to leave *Titus*, there to do what was unnecessary, what the Ministers who were there already, might do without Him: But it is Evident that tho' they were empower'd by Virtue of their Ordination, to Administer Sacraments, and instruct 'em, yet they were not vested with Episcopal Power, to Govern and Ordain, and therefore, that Disorders of all sorts might be rectify'd, and Grievances redress'd, and Places supply'd by rightly Ordain'd Ministers, *St. Paul* left *Titus* there, for that purpose. *For this Cause left I thee in Creet, that thou should'st set in order the things that are wanting, and Ordain Elders in every City; as I had appointed thee. i. e. in a* Word,

* By Heresy is understood not only an Error in Faith; and the Fundamentals of Religion; but very often, also Diversity of Opinion advanc'd into Schism, To the Disturbance of the Peace of the Church: See *Pool's Synopsis* upon the Place.

† See the comment of *Estius* in *Pool's Synopsis*, &c. || *Sculterus*. ¶ *Beza* and *Piscator*.

Word. That thou as a Bishop shouldst do those things, which the *Presbyters* or Ministers have no right, or Commission to meddle with.

If it would consist with my intended Brevity, I might here observe, that St. *James* the just, (who was suppos'd not to be of the number of the twelve,) is yet stil'd an Apostle by St. *Paul*, *Gal.* i. 19. and was Constituted Bishop of *Jerusalem* by the Apostles, and in the controversy concerning Circumcision, mentioned *Acts*, 15: after the Apostles and Elders, v. 6. 7. had consider'd, and disputed much about that matter, and particularly St. *Peter*, St. *Barnabas*, and St. *Paul* had deliver'd their Opinions, we find St. *James* as President of that Assembly; (because held in his own district,) giving a Decisive Sentence, which put an end to that Dispute, v. 19.

Wherefore says He, my Sentence is, that we trouble not them which from the Gentiles are turn'd to God. Here also I might observe from *Acts*, 21 c. 17, 18, v. That when St. *Paul*, and the rest that accompany'd him were come to *Jerusalem*. The Brethren receiv'd 'em gladly. And the Day following, Paul went in with 'em unto * *James*, and all the † Elders were with him.

The Sense of all which is, that St. *James* was the chief Ruler or Bishop in the Church of *Jerusalem*, for otherwise what reason is there, that He should be so particularly mentioned. But what adds to the Probability of this, is, the consideration, that St. *Paul* speaking of an interview or meeting he had with some of the Apostles at *Jerusalem*, mentions St. *James* before St. *Peter*, and St.

* He was the Bishop of the Church of *Jerusalem* says *Grosius*. † His *Presbyters* or inferior Clergy says *Cornelius a Lapide*.

St. John (who were call'd to be Apostles by our Blessed Lord Himself.) Gal. 2. Ch. 9. V. [And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be Pillars perceived the Grace of God; that was given unto me, &c.] So that hence it appears, St. James had the Preference to them both, as being therein his own Diocesa.

To all which give me leave to add, what is observ'd upon this particular, from the Apostolical Constitutions, which are of very early Antiquity, and pass under the Name of St. Clement: Concerning those who were ordain'd by us Bishops in our Life Time, we signify to you, that they were these, James the Brother of our Lord, was ordain'd by us Bishop of Jerusalem: And many of the Fathers affirm the same thing, but for the sake of Brevity, I omit to mention them.

Now I might also insist upon it, that Epaphroditus, (whom St. Paul mentions in his Epistle to the Philippians, Ch. 2. 25. V.) was the Bishop of Philippi, and might observe some Passages in the antient Fathers, in which it is expressly affirm'd, that he had the Episcopal Character: But since my Design is, to be as brief as I can, I must hasten to other Observations: If any then be pleas'd to consult the Revelation of St. John, Ch. 1. He may inform himself that St. John was directed by our Blessed Saviour, who is Alpha, and Omega, the First and the Last, to write in a Book; what he saw, and to send it to the seven Churches of Asia, which are compar'd to seven Golden Candlesticks, as the Angels, or Bishops of them are compar'd to Seven Stars. But now that the Angels there mention'd were the Bishops which presid'd over, and govern'd those Churches, is very apparent from what follows in the 2d Chap. where we find them mention'd in the singular Number as single Persons, and some of them are severely blam'd

for their *Moderation*, *falsly* so call'd, for their scandalous Relaxation, and neglect of Discipline, for their Connivance at, and Toleration of damnable Heresies, and false Doctrines, which, it was in their Power to have suppress'd, at least, to have very much discourag'd by the wholesome Severities of *Ecclesiastical Censures*. And that these Angels there spoken of, were the Governours and Bishops of those Churches, might be further cleared, (and shall be if my *Adversary* gives Occasion) by the unanimous Suffrage, and Consent of the antient Writers, which our Author does not seem by his Performance to be much acquainted with. *

That the Church was govern'd by such as are now stil'd Bishops, even from the Beginning of Christianity is likewise attested by the most Primitive, and Early Writers. St. *Clemens* (of whom St. *Paul* makes honourable mention, *Phil.* 4. c. 3^d. and who lived *Anno Domini* 170, and was Bishop of *Rome*, and a Martyr,) gives us in his 1st. Epistle, [*Edition. Oxford*] to the *Corinthians* a very fair Intimation in this Respect, for in the 42^d Sect, he tells us, that 'The Apostles preaching thro' Countries and Cities, and proving by the Spirit the First Fruits of their Conversions, they appointed out of 'em Bishops and Deacons over such as should afterwards believe. And again, Sect. 45. 'The Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ, that
' Con-

* *Polycarp* was known to be the Angel or Bishop of the Church of *Smyrna*, whom *Ignatius* the Blessed Martyr mentions, as, by his Episcopacy, greater than his Clergy. *Onesimus* was Bishop of *Ephesus*, or rather Metropolitan, or Arch Bishop of that See, for the Multitude of Christians was so large, that in the Emperor *Leo* his Time, it had 36 Bishopricks under it. *Sardis* had 24. shall we think that these great Dioceses were, as some obscure Parishes, wherein were no Variety of eminent Persons? *Bp. Hall of Episcopacy*, P. 123.

Contests would arise concerning the Episcopacy or Church Government, and for this Reason, (having perfect Foreknowledge) they did Ordain those, whom we have mention'd before, and moreover gave this Prescript, that other approved Men should succeed those who dy'd in their Office and Ministry. And in the 40th Sect, Speaking of the Worship or Service of God, which all Christians are bound to perform, after he had said, that God has commanded this to be done at their Appointed Seasons, he adds that, the same Care must be had of the Persons that Minister unto him, for the Chief Priest has his proper Services; and to the Priests their proper Place is appointed; and to the Levites appertain their proper Services, or Deaconships. In which Words it is very plain, he represents the threefold Order in the Christian Church of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, by the like Number in the Jewish, High-priest, Priest, and Levite, thus far St. Clement, who convers'd with the Apostles themselves, and was by St. Peter constituted Bishop of Rome, who is call'd by St. Paul his Fellow Labourer in the Gospel, and whose Name was written in the Book of Life, Pb. 4. 3. And here it is to be noted, that this Epistle, out of which I have cited these Sentences, was in that great Repute with the first Christian Church, that it was publickly read with the Scriptures in the Congregation, as if it had been Canonical.

Anno Domini 71 St. Ignatius was constituted by the Apostles Bishop of Antioch, and suffer'd Martyrdom about the 10th Year of Trajan the Roman Emperor, which was but four Years or thereabouts after the Death of St. John, and had been, at that Time, 40 Years Bishop of Antioch. He wrote several Epistles to the Churches of Asia, to confirm them in the Faith, and establish them in Unity, and in order to that great and good End, he par-

cularly exhorts all Lay Christians to live in Obedience to their Bishops, Priests and Deacons, and the Clergy of the inferior Degrees to Reverence their Bishops. He very plainly distinguishes between a Bishop, and a Presbyter, and expressly mentions the three distinct Orders in the Church, *viz.* Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

He observes that the Bishops are the Governors of the Christian Church, and that they are so necessary to the being of a Church, that without a Bishop there can be no Church.

In his Epistle to the Hebrews, Sect. 1st. He makes an honourable mention of Onesimus their Bishop, and congratulates them that God *'Had granted* *em to enjoy such an Excellent Bishop.* And Sect. 2. after he had entreated them that Barsabas their Blessed Deacon might tarry longer, both for *their's,* and *their Bishop's Honour.* He exhorts em to be joy'd together in the *same* Mind and in the same Judgment, and to be *Subject* to their Bishop and his Presbytery, that they may be wholly and thoroughly Sanctified. Sect. 4. *'It will,* says he, *become you to run together according to the Will of your Bishop, as also you do, for your famous Presbytery moribund of God, is fitted as exactly to its Bishop, as the Stringer is to the Harp.* Sect. 5. *'Let no Man despise himself, if a Man be not within the Altar, he is depriv'd of the Bread of God.* And what he means by not being within the Altar, and depriv'd of the Bread of God, he fully explains afterwards in the same Section. Where he says, *'If the Prayer of One, or Two be of such Force, as we are told, Matt. 18. 19. How much more Powerful shall that of the Bishop, and the whole Church be? He therefore that does not come together into the same place, i. e. the Church, where the Bishop, or his Clergy commission'd by him, officiate, he is Proud, and has already condemn'd himself.* I heartily wish that these

those who dissent from the Communion of the Church, would seriously consider this, and lay it to Heart. In other Places of the same Epistle, he speaks of the Bishop, and the Reverence and Obedience due to him. In the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, Sect. 2. He mentions *Damas* their Bishop, *Bassus* and *Apollonius* their Presbyters, and *Sotion* their Deacon

In whom I rejoyce, forasmuch as he is Subject to his Bishop, as to the Grace of God, and to the Presbytery, as to the Law of Jesus Christ. Sect. 3. He cautions 'em, that they despise not their Bishop, tho' he was so *Appearance Young*, but to obey him, in Sincerity, in Honour of God, who requires it, for he that does not so, deceives not the Bishop whom he sees, but affronts Him that is Invisible, for whatsoever of this Kind is done, it reflects not upon Man, but upon God who knows the Secrets of our Hearts. Sect. 6. He speaks again of the three distinct Orders in the Church, which the *Presbyterians* disallow. *I exhort you that you study to do all things in a divine Concord: Your Bishop presiding in the place of God; your Presbyters in the place of the Council of the Apostles; and your Deacons most dear to me, being intrusted with the Ministry of Jesus Christ, who was with the Father before all Ages; and appear'd to the End to us. Let there be nothing that may be able to make a Division among you; but be ye united to your Bishop, and those who preside over you.* Sect. 7. As the Lord did nothing without the Father, being united to him; neither by himself, nor by his Apostles; so neither do ye do any thing without your Bishop and Presbyters, but being come together, let there be one Common Prayer, one Supplication. Sect. 13. He mentions again, *their worthy Bishop, and the well wrought Spiritual Crown of their Presbytery, and their Deacons, which were accord-*

According to God, and in the 15th Sect, which is the last of that Epistle he speaks of Polycarp, and calls him Bishop of the *Smyrnaans*.

In his Epistle to *Smyrnaans*, He says, Sect. 7. 'Flee Divisions, as the Beginning of Evils. Sect. 8. All of you follow your Bishop, as Jesus Christ the Father; and the *Presbytery*, as the Apostles; and Reverence the *Deacons* as the Command of God. Let no Man do any thing of what belongs to the Church, without the Bishop. Let that Sacrament be look'd upon to be firm, and effectual, which is administred by the Bishop, or him to whom the Bishop has committed it, Wherever the Bishop is, there let the People be; as where Christ is, there the heavenly Host is gather'd together. It is not lawful without the Bishop neither to Baptize; nor to make the Love-Feast. But what he approves of, is well-pleasing to God. Sect. 9. 'He that honours the Bishop, shall be honour'd of God. But he that does any thing without his Knowledge, Ministers to the Devil, Sect. 12. 'I salute your very worthy Bishops, your venerable *Presbytery*, and the *Deacons* my Fellow-Servants.

In his Epistle to *Polycarp* who was a Disciple to St. John the Apostle and Evangelist, and was Bishop of *Smyrna*, he speaks thus, Sect. 6. Give heed to your Bishop, that God may attend to you, My Soul be Security for them who submit to the Bishop, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and my Portion be together with theirs in God.

And speaking to *Polycarp* himself, Sect. 4. He says, 'Let nothing be done but with thy Knowledge, and Consent. In the Epistle to the *Trallians*, Sect. 1. He mentions *Polybius* their Bishop. Sect 2. He looks upon their Subjection to their Bishop, to be a certain Sign that they were Followers

lowers of God, ' Forasmuch as you are Subject
 ' to your Bishop as to Jesus Christ, you appear to
 ' me to live not, after the Manner of Men, but
 ' according to Jesus Christ. Also be subject to
 ' your *Presbyters*, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ
 ' our hope. The *Deacons* also being the *Ministers*
 ' of the Mysteries of Jesus Christ must by all means
 ' please all. Sect. 3. ' In like manner let all Re-
 ' verence the *Deacons* as Jesus Christ, and the *Bish-*
 ' *op* as the Father, and the *Presbyters*, as the *San-*
 ' *hedrim* of God, and College of the Apostles,
 ' without these there is no Church. And speaking
 of *Hereticks* in the following Sections, he prescribes
 Sect. 7. The Method how they might be guarded
 against 'em; ' And that you will do if you are
 ' not puffed up; but continue inseperable from Je-
 ' sus Christ who is God, and from your Bishop;
 ' and from the Commands of the Apostles. He
 ' that is within the *Altar*, is pure: But he that
 ' is without is not pure; that is, he that do's any
 ' thing without the *Bishop*, the *Presbyters*, and
 ' *Deacons*; is not pure in his Conscience. Sect. 12.
 After he had recommended Concord, and Prayers
 for one another. He adds, ' It becomes every one
 ' of you, especially the *Presbyters*, to refresh your
 ' Bishop to the Honour of the Father of Jesus Christ,
 ' and of the Apostles. Sect. 13. Which is the last
 in that Epistle. ' Farewel in the Lord; being Sub-
 ' ject to your *Bishop*, as to the Command of God,
 ' and likewise to the *Presbytery*.

In the Inscription of the Epistle to the *Phila-*
delphians, ' He salutes them in the Blood of Jesus
 ' Christ, especially if they are at Unity with the
 ' *Bishop*, and *Presbyters* who are with him, and the
 ' *Deacons* appointed according to the Mind of Je-
 ' sus Christ. Sect. 3. of that Epistle. ' As many
 ' as are of Jesus Christ are also with their *Bishops*.
 ' And as many as shall by Repentance return
 into

into the Unity of the Church; even these also shall be the Servants of God, that they may live according to Jesus Christ. Be not deceived: If any one follows him that makes a *Schism in the Church*, he shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.

SECT. 4. ' Make it therefore your Endeavour to partake of the same *Eucharist*, for there is but one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup, unto the Unity of his Blood, one Altar, as there is one *Bishop* together with his *Presbytery*, and the *Deacons* my Fellow Servants; that so whatever you do, you may do it according to God's Will. SECT. 7. ' Attend to the *Bishop*, and to the *Presbytery*, and to the *Deacons*; the Spirit speaks on this Manner, without the *Bishop* do Nothing; *Keep your Bodies, as the Temples of God; Love Unity, Flow Divisions.*

SECT. 2. ' For where there is Division, God dwelleth not. But the Lord forgives all that Repent unto the Unity of God; and the Unity of the *Bishop*. SECT. 10. Speaking of the Church of *Antioch*, which was then in Peace, he says; ' It will become you, as the Church of God; to Ordain some *Deacon* to go thither, as the Ambassador of God. As also other neighbouring Churches have sent; some *Bishops*, some *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. In his Epistle to the *Romans*, SECT. 2. He puts em in Mind that they have reason to praise God, that he has vouchsafed to bring a *Bishop* of *Syria* unto 'em, being sent from the *East*, unto the *West*. Where he means himself, who was going from *Alex* to *Rome*, to be devoured by Wild Beasts, for his Profession of the Christian Religion.

And thus I have also observed from St. *Irenaeus*, that there were in his Time, three Orders of Church Officers as there are in the Church of *England*; viz, *Bishops*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*; that the *Bishops* were Superior to the other two Orders; and were the

the Governours of their Respective Churches, are the Principles of Unity in their several Districts and Dioceses, is so very evident from what I have cited, he who is not convinced by such plain Demonstration, is utterly incapable of Conviction : Such an one would not give Credit even to an Angel if sent from Heaven, to ascertain him of this Truth, which is as clear as Words can possibly make. Does not this blessed Martyr address himself to the Bishops of the Churches, as to single Persons ? Does not he charge the *Presbyters* and *Deacons* to be obedient to them, to honour, and respect them, and to do Nothing without their Consent ? But pray, to what purpose is all this strict Injunction, if there be no Subordination of Church Officers ? Why are *Presbyters*, and *Deacons* required to do all this, if Bishops are not Superiors ? Can any unprejudic'd, and disinterest'd Man believe, that Presbyterian Government is the Government which Christ instituted in his Church, when he considers that our blessed Saviour himself appointed a Subordination, and establish'd higher and lower Orders, when the Apostles after his Death fix'd Bishops in all the Churches of Christ, when St. *Ignatius* who liv'd in the Apostolick Age, and convers'd with the Apostles, and was constituted by them Bishop of *Antioch*, expressly tells us in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, Sect. 3. 'That as Jesus Christ is the Mind of the Father, so are Bishops who are appointed to the utmost bounds of the Earth, are the Mind of Jesus Christ. And accordingly if any consult the Ecclesiastical Writers, he will find, that as Episcopacy was appointed by God in the *Jewish* Church, so it continu'd in the *Christian* Church from our blessed Saviour for 1500 Years without a Rival. And I here challenge Mr. *Shaw* to shew me any *Christian* Church within that Period which was not govern'd by Bishops as the

X

Church

Church of England is. But to return to the Apostolical Fathers. * *St. Hermas* (who is suppos'd to be the same *St. Paul* mentions *Rom. 16, 14.*) has a Passage or two in his Books which plainly make for the Cause of Episcopacy I now defend. For in his Book call'd *The Visions*, he has these Words, ' And thou shalt write two Books ; and send one to *Clement*, and one to *Grapte*. For *Clement* shall send it to the foreign Cities, because it is permitted him so to do. But *Grapte* shall admonish the Widows, and Orphans. But thou shalt read it to the Elders. In which Words 'tis easie to observe a Distinction made by *St. Clement* of *Rome*, and the Elders of the Church. † And in the 3d. *Vision* the 5th Sect. ' The Square, and white Stones which agree exactly in their Joynts, are the Apostles; and Bishops, and Doctors, and Ministers, who thro' the Mercy of God are come in, and exercised Episcopacy, or govern'd. And in his third Book, call'd, *The Similitudes*, are these Words, ' They are such as believed, and some of them have been Bishops, that is, Governors of the Churches. Then such as have been set over inferior Ministers. So that from this Apostolical Author, we plainly see, that Bishops presided as Governors in the Church of Christ. *Justin Martyr* who flourish'd about the Middle of the 2d. Century makes mention, in his 2d. Apology, of the President in the Religious Assemblies, by whom all understand the Bishop, ‡ and now I am advanc'd to the Middle of the second Century, I may stop here tho' I intended to have gone further, because the greatest Advocates for Presbyterian

* See *St. Hermas* his Pastor.

† See *Vision*, Lib. 4. Vol. 2. Sect. 1st.

‡ See *Lib. 1. Vol. 3. Sect. 5.*

§ See *L. 1. 2d. Sim. 9. Sect. 27.*

¶ See Dr. *Grabe's* Edition of *Justin Martyr*.

Government, do allow that about the Year of our Lord 140 Bishops were settled all over the Christian World, but by what I have observ'd already, I hope it clearly appears; that Episcopacy was instituted from the very beginning of Christianity, and let Mr. *Shaw* shew, (if he can,) the time when Episcopacy was not; let him instance any Church, which was not govern'd by Bishops. I know indeed it has been said, that at first the Church of Christ was governed by *Presbyters*, but to prevent Schisms, Presbyterian Government was alter'd for Episcopal, but Affirmation is no Proof, I expect therefore Mr. *Shaw* to offer an Argument in his next Performance, (for he has offer'd no Argument as yet to prove this Point, and to invalidate (if he can do it,) the flagrant Authorities I have urg'd from Scripture, and the Antient Fathers. In short, the Ecclesiastical History furnishes us with particular Accounts how the Church of Christ was govern'd, and expressly mentions the Names of those who were constituted Bishops, and assures us that the Apostles themselves ordain'd those Persons following to be Bishops; viz. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite* to be Bishop of *Athens*, *Caius* of *Thessalonica*, *Archippus* of *Colosse*, *Onesimus* of *Ephesus*, *Antipas* of *Pergamus*, *Epaphroditus* of *Philippi*, *Crescens* of the *Gauls*, *Eraustus* of *Macedonia*, *Trophimus* of *Arles*, *Jason* of *Tarsus*, *Onesiphorus* of *Colophon*, *Quartus* of *Berytus*, *Paul* the Proconsul of *Narbona*, not to mention *Timothy*, and *Titus* before spoken of. To say; as some have done, that a Bishop, and Presbyter were the same, because the Word Bishop has been used Promiscuously, is a very absurd Way of Reasoning, and what the Presbyterians themselves will not allow to be good in other Cases. For according to this Way of Arguing, the Roman Emperor and his General were the same, because the Word *Imperator* was applied

ed

ed to both, and signifies both an Emperor and General, but will any Man from thence conclude that there never was such a Person as *Augustus*, or *Claudius*, or *Nero*, who were Emperors, and chief Governours in *Rome*? Is not *Dux* the Latin Word for a Captain, as well as for a Duke, but will any Man of Sence from thence infer that every Captain in Her Majesties Army is a Duke of *Great Britain*, and stands upon the Level with him? Was not the Title of Grace given formerly to the Kings of *England*, (to Instance particularly King *Henry* the 8th.) and is not the same Title now a Days apply'd to the Dukes of this Kingdom? Should then any Common-Wealth-Man either in private Conversation, or in Parliament, argue that the Monarchical Government is not the antient Government of this Kingdom therefore ought to be chang'd for some other Form of Government, would his Argument be allowed to be good, and conclusive? Would he not be presently told by the Friends of the Monarchy, that if he would be pleased to consult the Histories of all Ages, he might find that this Kingdom was always governed by a Monarch who is the Supreme Governour, and from whom Inferiour Magistrates derive their Power, and Authority? And may not one argue after the same manner *a fortiori* for Episcopacy? Does it not appear from what has been before observ'd, that notwithstanding the promiscuous Use of Names, the Order of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* was ever distinct? And because our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ is call'd, *Rom. 15. c. 8. v. The Minister of Circumcision*, or according to the Original, *the Deacon of Circumcision*, was he therefore no more than a *Deacon*? Had he no more Authority in the Church of God, than a *Deacon* has? But to make this Matter as intelligible as possible to the Vulgar; the Word

Pres-

Presbyter which is originally a *Greek Word*, signifies an *Elderman*, or an *Alderman*, one, who is an *Elder*, not with Respect of Age only, but of Authority also, for as 'tis plain in Scripture, the *Elders* were the Heads of the People. But now will any Man of common Sense conclude that every *Presbyter* in the Church is an *Alderman* of the City, or Borough where he lives. or that an *Alderman* is a *Clergyman*? Again, The Word *Bishop* in the *Greek Language* is *Overseer of the Flock of Christ*, and in that Sense every Minister of a Parish may be said to be a *Bishop*, as he takes care of the Souls committed to his Charge, but will it therefore follow, that he is equal to him, who is the chief Pastor, or *Bishop* of the Diocese? Does this prove that he has the Power to Ordain, or censure his neighbouring Fellow Ministers? So absurd is that Reasoning, which would make *Bishops* and *Presbyters* to be the same, because the same Name has been sometimes applyed to both: but granting that to be true, which is so strenuously contended for, it is yet very certain, that those of the highest Order, (whom we now call *Bishops*) were distinguish'd from those of the second Order, (whom we now call *Presbyters*, or *Priests*,) by such Titles as were appropriated to them only. And tho' *Bishops* are the Apostles Successors, and were antiently stil'd Apostles, * yet, such was their great Humility, and Modesty, that we are told, they declin'd the Title, and appropriated it intirely to those who were immediately call'd to be Apostles by our Blessed Saviour, contenting themselves with the Title of *Bishops*, which continues at this very Day. As to that Notion some have of late possess'd themselves with, that a Primitive *Bishop* was only

2

* St. James Bishop of *Jernsalem* was call'd the Thirteenth Apostle, tho' he was none of the Twelve.

a Pastor of a particular Congregation, or Parish I affirm, that there is no good Foundation for it either in Scripture, or Antiquity; the contrary is manifest from both; and the first Man that I can find, to whom this whim of the Brain owes its Original, was Mr. *David Clarkson* who wrote a Book to that Purpose not very many years ago, but was answer'd by the Learned Dr. *Henry Maurice* in a Book call'd, *Diocesan Episcopacy* in which he fully baffles that capricious Writer, exposes the Weakness of his Arguments, and clearly proves that Primitive Episcopacy was Diocesan as ours in *England* is, i. e. that the Bishop of the City-Church had the Inspection, and Government of the other Congregations in the same City, or Villages adjacent, and had many Presbyters and Deacons under him. So that if any Man would be fully inform'd in this particular, I doubt not, (if he will lay aside his prejudice,) but he may receive Satisfaction from that worthy Author: To whom give me leave to add, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, the late learned Bishop of *Worcester*, who gives us a brief Account of this Matter in his excellent Book, Entitled, *The Unreasonableness of Separation*. Part 3. P. 219. to P. 265. How can any Man reasonably suppose that there was antiently, but one Congregation of Christians in a City, that considers how numerous the Converts to Christianity daily were. We are told *Acts 2. Ch. 41. V.* that three thousand Souls were converted in one Day, and *Ch. 4. 4. V.* that another time, the Number of Men who heard the Word, and believed, was above five thousand. And *Ch. 5. 14. V.* Believers were the more added to the Lord, Multitudes both of Men and Women. *Ch. 11. 21. V.* At Antioch, a great Number believed, and turned to the Lord. And *V. 26.* 'Tis said, that a whole Year the Apostles assembled themselves with the Church, and taught much People. And again, *Ch 13. 1.* There is mention

mention made of several Prophets, and Teachers who were at *Antioch*, to Minister to the Christians, who were very numerous; so that hence it is highly probable, that there were many Congregations in one City, over which the Bishop presided, and since he could not instruct 'em all himself, he doubtless appointed his *Presbyters* and *Deacons* to do it, under his Influence, and by his Direction. But what raises this Probability to a certainty, is the consideration, that all the Churches, (of which the Records are preserv'd,) were govern'd by a Bishop, who had many *Presbyters*, and *Deacons* under him, to perform divine Offices to the Congregations in his Diocese, in which himself could not be present. When St. *Cyprian* sent *Numidicus* to be plac'd among the *Presbyters* of *Carthage*, he gives this Reason for it, *that he might adorn the plenty of his Presbyters with such worthy Men, it being now impair'd by the Fall of Some*, during the Persecution. * In another Epistle he complains that a great Number of his Clergy were absent, and the few that remain'd were hardly sufficient for that Work. || About that time *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome* mentions *Forty Six Presbyters* he had with him in that City. Now can any Man that carries Reason along with him, ever imagine, that the Bishop had all these Clergymen to serve only one Congregation? Who can, upon any Grounds of Reason, suppose so absurd a Thing, as that so many Thousand Christian-Converts should meet together in one Place of Worship, and make but one Congregation? If the Bishop of this, or that City, was no more than a Minister of a single Congregation, as some would fain persuade us, what Occasion had he for such a great Number of *Presbyters* and *Deacons* to

* See St. *Cyprian's* Epistles. Epist. 40. Oxford Edition.

|| See also Epist. 37.

to assist him, when a lesser might have serv'd the Turn? But perhaps the Dissenters fancy that the first Christian Churches were so much larger than any Cathedral in *England*, as to contain all the Christians both of the City, and places adjacent, and that, for Instance, *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, and his 46 Presbyters might be all preaching at the same time, and yet not disturb one another. Perhaps they may fancy that the Church in those Days, was as large, and capacious as *St. Peter's* now is at *Rome*. If their Imagination be so strong, I am very much apt to think, they will find but few, besides themselves, that are so fanciful. In a Word, that by a Bishop mentioned in Antiquity, we are to understand a Diocesan Bishop, and not a Parish Minister only, is further evident from this Consideration, that the Bishop of the City ordain'd *Chorepiscopi*, or as I may term them, *Suffragan Bishop*, whom he placed in such and such parts of his Diocess in the Country to Inspect the Churches, and ordain Presbyters and Deacons, to supply them if the Bishop of the Diocess thought fit, for they might not Ordain any without his License, from which Instance, it may, I think, be very fairly inferr'd, that the Primitive Episcopal Power, was not confin'd to a Parish, or single Congregation, but was Diocesan. And it is very observable, that how many Congregations soever, there were in one City, they were Subject to the (one) Bishop of the City, for two Bps were not allow'd to govern in one City, how large soever it was, 'for whosoever says **St. Cyprian*, is made Bishop, when one is made already, who ought to be alone, He is not another Bishop, but none at all. But now if there might have been more than one Bishop in a City, why did not the Catholics prevent

* See *St. Cyprian's Epist.* 55, *Oxford Edition*.

vent the Schism of the Donatists, when there was a competition between *Majrinus* and *Cacilian*? why did they not prevent the *Novatian* Schism, when there was the like Competition between *Cornelius* and *Novatian*? But had they thought it lawful, I make no doubt, they would have prevented the Mischiefs that those Schisms produc'd, by a free Admission of the Persons recommended.

But to draw towards a Conclusion of this Point; If Mr. *Shaw*, and his Brethren would diligently search Antiquity, and not Trade so much in little, paltry Pamphlets, I make no scruple to affirm, that they would find, that from the Beginning of Christianity, the Church of Christ was govern'd for 1500 Years by such Persons as we now call Bishops, and if he can shew the time when it was not so govern'd, if he can tell the *Æra* when the great Alteration of Church Government was made, if he will point out the honest *Presbyters* that enter'd their Protests against it, or wrote so much as one Book against such a Usurpation, he will make such a Discovery as was never made yet, by the most quick-sighted *Presbyterian* in the World, and which, when he does make, I faithfully promise to become one of his Disciples, a thing which I have at present a very great Aversion to. Had there been such an Alteration of Church Government as some Heads have dream'd, 'tis mighty strange, that none of the most early Writers should make mention of it, we have Histories now extant of what was done both before our blessed Saviour's Birth, and since, and the most memorable Transactions are recorded, nay, there are some Occurrences, and Accidents set down, which are not very material, especially when compared with this I am speaking of, how comes it to pass then that this is not related which would doubtless make a mighty Noise in the World? Wonderful it is, that there

F

should

should be no cross-grain'd *Presbyterian* to cry out upon the Innovation, not one of *Korah's* Complexion, and temper to tell the first Bishops that *they took too much upon 'em*, that they were *Antichristian Bishops*; and were departed from the Instituted Government of the Lord.

Do not our Annals, and Histories, (to instance in our own Kingdom) inform us of the Conquest made by the Duke of *Normandy*, the Baron's Wars, the Reformation of Religion, the grand Rebellion against, and barbarous Murder of *K. Charles. 1st* the happy Restoration, the late Revolution. What good Reason then can be given; why we meet with no Records of the Church to acquaint us with this pretended Alteration of Church Government, if there had been any such? It would doubtless have been taken Notice of, as well as those Occurrences before mentioned, but since no mention is made of it, we may conclude it to be a Fiction of the Brain : *Presbyterian Government* then is but of late Date, and novel Extraction. For till the Year 1541 i. e. about the time of Mr. *Calvin*, which is not 200 Years ago, there was no such thing in Being as a *Presbyterian-Church* (pardon the Solecism) to be found in any Part of the Christian World, and that Government was set up out of Necessity, for want of a better, and Mr. *Calvin* was so far from condemning or disliking the Episcopacy of the Church of *England*; that he approv'd of, and applauded it, as appears from his Letters to Queen *Elizabeth*, to the Arch Bishop of *Canterbury*, and to other Bishops of our Church; and he added further, that there were none such to be found as oppos'd the *Episcopal Hierarchy*, but only the *Papal*, which would make the Bishop of *Rome* to be supreme Head of the Church. ' But, says he, if they give us such an Hierarchy, in which the Bishops should so excell, as that they did not refuse

to be Subject to Christ, and to depend upon him, as their only Head, and refer all to him, when I will confess that they are worthy of all Anathemas, (if any such Men there be,) who will not reverence it, and submit themselves to it, with the utmost Obedience.

So that since there is in England such an Episcopacy, which acknowledges Jesus Christ as Head, all Dissenters from it are declar'd by Mr. Calvin to deserve an Anathema. i. e. to be accursed.

And Beza pronounces all Antiepiscopeans, Madmen, 'If there be any (says he) which you shall hardly persuade me to believe) who reject the whole Order of Episcopacy; God forbid that any Man in his Wits, should assent to the Madness of such Men. And speaking of the Church of England, and her Hierarchy, he declares he never design'd to oppose it, he calls her Episcopal Government a singular Blessing, and wishes she may ever enjoy it.

And as formerly, the Doctors of Geneva express'd their great Deference, and Respect for the Church of England, and her Episcopacy, so, of late the present Doctors and Professors have done the like in their Letters they have sent hither, and Mr. Turretin (in his Oration in the publick Act of Geneva May 11th, 1709. concerning the different Fates of the Christian Religion.) expressly mentions, in the Section of Government, the three Orders in the Church, and says that there 'was a Bishop even before that time, up to the first Antiquity, undoubtedly taken from the Example of the Jews, who had their Rosh Hachel, the Prince, or Head of of the Congregation.

The reformed Ministers, Mr. Le Moine of Leyden in Holland, Mr. De L'Angle of Charenton near Paris in France, and Mr. Claude, do likewise express

themselves, after a most decent and respectful manner, in relation to the *Church of England*, and her Government by Bishops, and condemn the Separation of our *Dissenters*, charging them flatly with being Guilty of the Sin of Schism.

Mr. *Claude* urges the *indispensable necessity* the reform'd were put under, to excuse their Submission to *Presbytery*.

So that our *Dissenters* Separation, and Rebellion against Episcopacy, is condemn'd not only by all Antiquity, but also by the Reform'd of latter Ages, so that they contradict the whole Christian World. But yet if I add the Reform'd in *Holland*, *Genova*, and *France*, and the *Kirk* of *Scotland*, to the *Dissenters* in *England*, they bear but the same Proportion, (as I remember one expresses it,) 'as a Mole-hill to a Mountain, for in all other parts of the Christian World, the Churches of Christ are submitted to, and govern'd by Bishops. As in *England*, *Ireland*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Norway*, *France*, *Spain*, *Portugal*, *Germany*, *Italy*, *Muscovia*, *Poland*, *Savoy*, *Sicily*, *Hungary*, and that *Greek* Church, not to mention the Principalities, and Islands belonging to the beforemention'd Kingdoms, to these I may *Tartaria*, *China*, and other places in *Asia*, where the Christians are govern'd by Bishops; as also in other parts of the World. And to shew, 'that *Episcopacy* has extended itself, equally 'with *Christianity*, which was carry'd by it, into the 'remotest corners of the Earth, I shall produce an Instance which I have met with in a Book call'd the five Discourses, written by the Learned Mr. *Lesley*.
 * 'In Countries so remote, and barbarous as Island
 'itself, we find the same care taken; Arz or Aras an
 'Islandish Priest, surnam'd Hintrode the Learned,
 'who flourish'd in the eleventh Century, and was 25
 Tears

* A Discourse shewing, who they are that are qualified to administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper, P. 7.

* *Tears Old, when Christianity was brought thither,*
 * *in his Book of that Country, written in Islandish,*
 * *has Transmitted to Posterity, not only the Succession,*
 * *but the Genealogies of the Bishop of Skalholt, and*
 * *Hola, (the two Episcopal Sees of Island) as they*
 * *succeeded one another in his time, upon which ac-*
 * *count the Bishops of Skalholt and Hola, and their*
 * *Succession are as remarkable proofs of Episcopacy,*
 * *tho' not so famous, as the Bishops of Canterbury and*
 * *London. And thus as Episcopacy was the Uni-*
 * *versal Government over the Christian World, and*
 * *now generally prevails, so 'tis observable, that the*
 * *Bishops alone were vested with the power of Ordina-*
 * *tion, as I have shewn already, so that it was ever*
 * *reputed a very great Sin, no less heinous than that*
 * *of Korah, Unziah, Uzzab, &c. to administer the*
 * *Sacraments, and to execute any Ministerial Acts,*
 * *without a Lawful call, or Ordination of a Bishop;*
 * *and if any pert, conceited Presbyters took upon 'em,*
 * *to Ordain, such Mock-Ordinations were solemnly*
 * *declar'd by the Catholick Church, in several Coun-*
 * *cils to be Invalid; the Persons who were so preten-*
 * *dedly Ordain'd, were esteem'd meer Lay-Men, and*
 * *their Ordainers were Censur'd for their Wicked-*
 * *ness. Thus Ischyas was depos'd by the Synod of*
 * *Alexandria; because he was Ordain'd by Colluthus*
 * *who was no more than a Presbyter, tho' He preten-*
 * *ded to be a Bishop. Thus the Ordinations of Eusi-*
 * *chianus and Muscus were condemn'd as Null, and*
 * *the Persons on whom, they, pretending to be Bishops,*
 * *had presum'd to lay their hands, were reduc'd to*
 * *the Quality of Lay-Men. Nay, the Council of*
 * *Sevil in Spain depos'd a Presbyter, and two Dea-*
 * *cons, upon whom a Bishop had laid his hands, be-*
 * *cause a Presbyter read the blessing, or consecration-*
 * *Prayer over them, tho' at the request of the Bishop*
 * *who having then sore Eyes, could not with conve-*
 * *nience do it himself.*

And

And because * *Aetius* asserted that a Bishop and a Presbyter were the same, (as our Presbyterians now

* This *Aetius* was of so envious a Disposition, that he could not bear the Advancement of his School-fellow *Eustathius* to that Bishoprick he expected, and disdainig (such was the Pride of his Heart, as well as 'tis of his Followers) to be thought an Inferiour, he endeavour'd to confound the two distinct Offices of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* and cited a Text of Scripture to patronize his Error, viz. that Passage of St. Paul, 1. Tim. 4. c. 14. v. *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery.* But that he, and the present Presbyterians plainly pervert the Sense of the Words, is evident from another Passage wherein St. Paul mentions St. Timothy's Ordination, which he tells Timothy he had received from him, 2. Tim. 1. c. 6. v. *Stir up the Gift that is in thee, by the laying on my Hands,* so that it is very evident that Timothy was not ordain'd by mere Presbyters, but by St. Paul who was an Apostle, and if by Presbytery is to be understood a Society of Presbyters, those Presbyters were the highest Officers in the Church, and not ordinary Presbyters, for since Timothy was a Bishop, 'It was never heard, or read, that Presbyters could Ordain Bishops, as St. Chrysostome, and other of the Fathers very well observe. See the learned Mr. Nelson's excellent Book of the Fasts, and Festivals, P. 539.

Theophylact, *Oecumenius* and others suppose that the Presbytery there spoken of, was a Company of Bishops, who joyn'd in the Consecration of a Bishop, as is the Custom of the Church of England. after the Example of the Primitive Church. See Dr. Hammonds Annotations on Acts of the Apostles. Ch. 11. V. 30.

Mr. Calvin understands the Words to signifie the Office of a Presbyter, and not a College of Presbyters, and so, many of the ancient Fathers understand the Words, and then what should hinder, (says the beforemention'd worthy Gentleman Mr. Nelson) but that the Text may be read thus. *Neglect not the Gift of the Presbyterate, or Office of a Presbyter, which is in thee, and which was given thee by Prophecy, with the Laying on of Hands.*

But granting to the Presbyterians that the Words carry that Sense, they so strenuously contend for, namely that there were ordinary Presbyters at Timothy's Ordination, it does not therefore follow that it was a Presbyterian Ordination; on the contrary, it is very evident, that he was ordain'd by St. Paul, who was doubtless superior to ordinary Presbyters,

with

now do.) alledging for Proof that Text where St. Paul speaks of *Timothy's Ordination with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*; he was therefore condemn'd as a Factious, Schismatical Novelist.

Epiphanius styles him, 'The Great Evil of the World. a Man Frantick in his Mind, proud, and conceited in Opinion, and an Heretick, nay so odious was he in the sight of all true and Orthodox Christians, that Bishop Hall tells us, that *This Patriarch of all Opposers of Episcopacy, was booted, not out of the Church only, but out of the Cities, Towns and Villages.*

And when those Presbyters *Baxter, Hughes, and Bowles*, with the rest that constitute *Smectymnus*, who had been regularly ordain'd Presbyters by Bishops, but afterwards rebell'd against their Bishops, as well as against their King. and departed from the Communion of the Church, and form'd a most wicked and unreasonable Schism, when I say, these *Archschismaticks* presum'd to ordain † Ministers in order to perpetuate *that* Schism, the
Act

with the Concurrence and Assistance of his Presbyters, for any Man that has but a tolerable Knowledge of the Greek Language, cannot be ignorant that the Greek Preposition *By* in that Text, 2. Tim. 1. 6. signifies the principal Cause, and the Greek Preposition *with* in 1. Tim. 4. 14. signifies the concurring, or assistant Cause. So that *Timothy* was ordain'd by St. Paul, who had the Power of Ordination, with the Assistance of his Presbyters then present with him, whom he desired to shew their Approbation of the Choice, by Laying on their Hands with him, as is the Practice of the Church of England, for when the Bishop ordains a Presbyter, he requires the Presbyters present to lay on their Hands with him. So that it cannot be concluded you see, from this Text, the Presbyterians quote, and lay so much stress upon, that Presbyters may ordain; on the contrary, it appears, that the Bishop alone has the Power of Ordination.

† Which Mock Ordination of theirs began in the time of that grand Rebellion against K. Ch: 1st. about 60 Years ago.

Act was condemned by all true Churchmen, as unwarrantable and sinful; and as great a Usurpation as *that of Korah*, and his Complices, for which God punished them after a most exemplary manner, for we are told *Numb. 16.* that because they usurped upon the Office of *Aaron*, the High-priest, as our modern *Korabites* do, upon the Bishops, therefore *V. 32. The Earth opened her Mouth, and swallowed them up, and their Houses, and all the Men that appertained unto Korah, and all their Goods. V. 33. They, and all that appertained unto them, went down Alive into the Pit, and the Earth closed upon them, and they perished from among the Congregation.*

That those Usurping Presbyters before spoken of, had not, by Virtue of their Episcopal Ordination, received any Commission to Ordain others, is most plain and demonstrative, for if we consult the Office of Ordination in the Church of *England*, it will appear, that when Bishops ordained them Presbyters, they gave them a Commission to administer the blessed Sacraments, to exercise the power of the Keys, *i. e.* to Excommunicate the Obstinate, and absolve the penitent, and to preach the Word of God, but never empowered them to Ordain, and therefore, how is it possible that *They* could Ordain Ministers, and grant a Commission to others, when they had not received any Commission themselves for that purpose? Since then the Ordination of those who were mere Presbyters was Null, and Void in it self at first, for want of a compleat Authority, it is, and will be Null and Void to the End, for Time can never make that to be Valid afterwards, which was Invalid in the Original. In a Word, Presbyterian Ordination was so unusual, so unheard of a practice, till within these 200 Years, that it was thought, that Necessity it self could not justify any Man in performing any
Minis-

Ministerial Act, without a Commission by an Episcopal Ordination, for no Man taketh this Honour to himself, but he that is call'd of God, as was Aaron; Heb. 5. c. 4 v. Among many Instances which might be offer'd, I present the Reader only with one, the truth of which, is attested by Persons of unquestionable integrity, and great Learning. * The Story in short is this: The *Bohemians* being harass'd, and persecuted by those, who were addicted to the Errors, and superstitions of the *Roman See*; retir'd to the Mountainous Country, and Woods near *Silesia*, where they might serve God with a good Conscience. But whilst they were there, nothing troubled them so much, as the thought of the want there would be of a Lawful Ministry, when the Ministers who were with them, and took care of their Souls, were dead. It therefore was judg'd expedient, that the *Presbyters* or Ministers then living, should Ordain some, and those, others again from time to time, that so a Succession of Ministers might be preserv'd. Now tho' here was an apparent necessity to be pleaded, yet they very much fear'd, *'whether such an Ordination, by which a Presbyter, and not a Bishop, should create another Presbyter would be Lawful; and how they should be able to maintain such an Ordination, as well against others, when oppos'd, as to their own People, if by them question'd.* Wherefore after an anxious deliberation of some Years, there met in the Year of our Lord 1467 70 Men of chiefest Note of them who were dispersed through *Bohemia*;
G and

* See Dr. Durell's view of the Government, and publick Worship of God, in the reform'd Churches beyond the Seas London Edit. 1662. p. 11. upon reading which Book, Mr. Lane a Dissenting Schoolmaster, at *Leicester* was convinc'd, he renounc'd the Schism he had been in, and came into the Communion of the Church of England; See Dr. Hicks's Preface to *Lay-Baptism* Invalid; p. 51.

and *Moravia*, who having made their most solemn Addresses to God with Prayers and Tears, beseeching Him, to let them understand whether their Purpose were agreeable to his Holy Will : They then proceeded to enquire what his Will was by casting Lots. Nine Men most worthy to be made Bishops were chosen by Votes ; and a Child no way conscious of this Matter, being brought in, twelve small pieces of Paper folded up, were put into his Hands ; Nine of these Papers were blank, but on other Three, there was written, *Est*, that is, it is, to wit, the Will of God, which they requested to know. Now it might have so happened, that the Nine Persons might have had the Nine Blanks, which would have been a Token of God's Disapprobation, and denial of their Design. But it came to pass, that the three written Papers were deliver'd by the Child to Three of them, Namely, *Matthias Kunwaldins*, *Thomas Prelacius*, and *Elias Krenovius*, who were all in their several Ways, very worthy Persons : The first was a very Pious, the second a very Learned, the third a very Active Man. This divine Election (as it was justly esteemed) Occasion'd Joy in all. But still they were at a Loss, how an Episcopal Consecration might be obtained. At length, hearing that there were some *Waldenses* upon the confines of *Austria*, and *Moravia*, the *Bohemians* send three Ministers, who having related their Sufferings, and declar'd their Faith and Doctrine, *Stephanus* one of their Bishops, calling another Bishop, and some Ministers to join with him in laying on of Hands, they were ordain'd Bishops, and so a Succession was preserv'd. Thus I have given a brief Account of this extraordinary Transaction. If the Reader please to see it more at large related, I refer him to the Authors before mentioned.

From what I have observed from Scripture, and
An-

Antiquity, &c. I hope, I have clearly Prov'd, that the Order of Bishops is distinct from that of Presbyters, and that the Church of Christ, ever was, and ought to be govern'd by Bishops, as the Governors of the Church are now styled. I believe also I may with some Degree of Assurance affirm, that I have made it appear, that no Ordination but Episcopal is Valid, and consequently Mr. *Shaw*, and his Brethren having received no Ordination from a Bishop, they are therefore merely Laymen, and no commissioned Officers, or Ministers of Jesus Christ; so that they have no Authority to perform any Clerical Acts. The Baptisms then which are pretendedly administered by this Gentleman, and his *Fellow-Korabites*, are no other than Lay-Baptisms, and which, whether they are valid, or no, I shall now consider. That Lay-Baptism is Invalid, I have already shewn, is not only the Opinion of many Bishops and Divines of the Church of *England*, both Dead and Living, but is expressly declar'd to be so, by the Reform'd, met in several National Synods, by the old Puritans, and the present Kirk of *Scotland*, * nay, I believe, I may with truth affirm, that 'tis the Judgment of the *Dissenting* Teachers themselves, (if they would be consistent with themselves, and speak their minds) that none ought to administer the Sacrament of Baptism, but a Lawful Minister.

For they subscribe † to the 23d Article of our Church, which in plainest Words declares, *it is*

G 2

not

* See P. 7. of this discourse, to P. 17.

† See the Act of exemption, or as it is commonly, ~~So~~ falsely call'd, the Toleration Act. 1 *Will. and Mar.* which requires *Dissenting* Teachers, of the *Presbyterian* Perswasion, to subscribe the 39 Articles of our Church, except the 34, 35, 36. and this clause in the 20th Act. The Church hath power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith.

It not Lawful for any Man to take upon him, the Office of publick Preaching, or Ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be Lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. So that by their Subscription to this Article, they declare it a Sin for any Layman to Baptize. And if it be a Sin, as it must be if it be not Lawful, then by their own Confession, they incur the Guilt of that Sin, when they presume to Baptize, for, as I have prov'd above, they are but Laymen, because they have never been *truly* Ordain'd. But whether some Men will believe it or no, 'tis very evident, that the Power of Baptizing, is confin'd to the Clergy only, for it deserves our Observation, that when our Blessed Saviour was about to *leave this World, and ascend up unto the Father*, He orders the eleven Apostles, who were Clergymen, to meet him at the place where he had before appointed, and to them, and none else of his Disciples, he gives a Commission to Baptize, *St. Mat. 28. c. 19 v. Go ye therefore and teach, or Disciple, (as the Greek Word may be rendred) all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Now had our Blessed Saviour design'd that all his Disciples at large, who did then, and should hereafter believe in him, should be authoriz'd to Administer Baptism, doubtless he would have declar'd so, and instead of saying to the Apostles, *go ye*, he would have added, *go ye*, and the rest that profess my Religion, and teach, or Disciple them, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But since he gave the Commission to a Select number *i. e.* to the eleven beforementioned, at the 16 v. 'tis plain, that all the rest to whom it was not granted, were Excluded.

And what confirms this Observation is, the consideration that the Converts to Christianity were Bap-

Baptiz'd by the Apostles, or others who were Ordain'd by them, *i. e.* in one Word, by Clergymen only, as is manifest from several places of the Scriptures of the New Testament. * And that the primitive Christians, look'd upon this Commission as deliver'd only to the Clergy, is exceedingly evident from Antiquity. So that for a considerable time, after our Blessed Saviour had Instituted his Religion, there is not so much as one instance to be given of any Layman, that ever presum'd to Baptize; the antient Writers affirm, that the Administration of Baptism is so confin'd to the Bishop, and his Clergy, that none but he, and those he Ordains, ought to perform that Office of Baptism. As St. Ignarius says, *that nothing which relates to the Church, must be done without the Bishops consent so he affirms in particular that it is not Lawful to Baptize without it.* Tertullian affirms also, *that the power of Baptizing, is primarily Lodg'd in the Chief Priest, or Bishop, and that the Presbyters and Deacons, also may Baptize, but not without the Bishops Authority.* St. Cyprian makes Baptism an essential part of the Episcopal Office: *'We, meaning the Bishops, who give the first Baptism to believers by our Lords Permission.* He further affirms, that the Baptism of Hereticks, and Schismaticks, is Invalid, because it is Administred without the Bishops Authority, to whom in the Person of Peter and the Apostles, our Lord gave Power to remit Sins in Baptism. Fortunatus Bishop of Thuchaboris, in his Suffrage at the Council of Carthage, says, that *'Christ gave the Power of Baptism to Bishops, and not to Hereticks;* and Concludes, that they who are out of the Church, and act without the Bishops Authority, can't Administer Valid Baptism. If those then who had receiv'd a true Episcopal Ordination, could

* St. John I. c. 33 v. 3. c. 22, 23. v. 48. 8. c. 38 v. 1 Cor. I. c. 16 v.

could not Validly Baptize, when they had cut themselves off from the Communion of the Church, by *Heresy* or *Schism*, as the *African* Bishops believ'd, how then can Laymen Baptize Validly, who were never Ordain'd at all? *Arbanasius* so appropriates the Power of Baptism, to the Episcopal Office, in so strict and unalienable a manner, that if Bishops fail, this power, and Consequently the Church itself, must fail with them. St. *Jerom* tells us, 'that neither Presbyters, nor Deacons can Lawfully Baptize in ordinary Cases, without the Bishop's Commission for it.

St. *Ambrose* asserts the same, that though Presbyters do Baptize, yet they derive their Authority from their Superior, † i. e. the Bishop.

The Apostolical Constitutions which are very ancient inform us, that it was permitted only to Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, to Baptize, it is not Lawful for any other to Baptize. St. *Basil* in his Epistle to *Amphilochius* says, that those who are Baptiz'd by Hereticks, ought to be Baptiz'd again, for their Baptism is as Invalid, as if it had been Administred by Laymen. Again, The Apostolical Constitutions say, 'We allow not, that Laymen shall perform any Sacerdotal Act, as Baptism.

‡ St. *Cyprian* in his Epistle to *Jubaianus* writes thus, Ep. 73.

Dearest Brother.

I Do not propose this without Divine Warrant ;
when I say, God has disposed all things by a certain Law, and a proper Ordinance, and that none can Usurp, any thing against the Bishops, all being sub-

* See Dr. Potter of Church Government, p. 254.

† See Mr. Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church 1. Vol. p. 78.

‡ See *Johan Caspari Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*, 1. Vol. p. 630.

§ See Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age. P. 285. 289.

subject to them. For Corah, Dathan, and, Abiron, attempted to assume to themselves [Licentiam] an independent Power of Sacrificing, against Moses and Aaron the Priest; and they were singularly punished for it, because it was Unlawful. Fortunatus says in the venerable Council of Carthage. Those who are out of the Church, [as every Dissenting-Teacher certainly is] and stand against Christ, and scatter his Flock, cannot Baptize, being out of the Church.

Neither is Firmilian less peremptory: No Hereticks, (says he,) who cut themselves from the Church of God, can have any Power or Grace, seeing all Power and Grace is restricted to the Church, where, (not every Senior, but) those Seniors Rule, who possess the Power of Baptizing, Imposing Hands (in Confirmation) and Ordaining. For as an Heretick, cannot Ordain, or confirm, so neither can he Baptize.

Again, He, and all the Bishops; who met with him in the Synod of Iconium, decreed that all those should be holden as Unbaptiz'd, who were Baptiz'd by such as had once been Bishops in the Catholick Church, if they were Baptized by them after they had separated from the Church.

I might here mention the Suffrages of Nemesianus à Thubunis, Secundinus à Cealias, Novatus à Tucca, Secundianus à Thambeis, Saturninus à Thucca, Geminus à Furnis, Clarus à Mustula, but These Testimonies I have here recited, are sufficient to shew that it was the Judgment of the African Churches that the Power of Baptism is lodg'd in the Bishop, and therefore no Layman can Baptize without Ordination from him, much less in wilful Opposition to him, and the Ministers ordain'd by him, as is the Practice of our Dissenting-Teachers.

What the Judgment of the Church of England is in

in this Case, is so clear, no Man can be long in a suspense concerning it. And as the Primitive Church was the Model by which she was reform'd, so in this Point she is consentient with the other. For our Church utterly disallows of Lay-Baptisms, as well as those pure Churches in the first Ages of the Gospel. But now to know the Judgment of the Church of *England*, must we be beholden for our Intelligence, to this *Latitudinarian*, or that *Freethinker*? Are we bound to take the Opinions of private Men, which they would saign palm upon us, as the Judgment of the Church of *England*? Certainly no. To know then the true Sense of the Church of *England*, we must not depend upon this or that Man's Opinion, or Declaration, or corrupt Practice which owes its rise to Schism, or a Relaxation of Discipline, but we must examine the Homilies, Articles, Liturgy, Rubrics and Canons of the Church, and from *them* we must learn its Sense. To begin then with the Articles which were made for the stablishing of Consent, touching *True Religion*, and, (as his Majesties Declaration prefix'd assures us,) ' *Do contain the true Doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's Word*; Now they do expressly condemn Dissenters, and other Lay-Baptisms. For the 23d Article declares, ' *It is not Lawful for any Man to take upon him the Office of publick Preaching, or Ministering the Sacraments, [of which Baptism is one] before he be Lawfully called, and sent to execute the same.* From which Words it is very plain that our Church esteems it a very great Sin, for any to Baptize without a Commission: Since then a Layman has no Commission, he is not empowered, or qualify'd to Baptize, and is therefore excluded the Administration of Baptism, because he is not *Lawfully Called, and Sent*. Can any Man then with Truth affirm, that the Mock-

Baptism

Baptism of such unauthoriz'd Person is good, and valid ? Does not the Command of the Church, in the Office of Baptism, to use the Element of Water, and these Words in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, plainly forbid any other Matter but Water, or any Form, but that in the Name of the blessed Trinity ? Suppose now that a lawful Minister should (wickedly) pretend to Baptize a Child with Oil, or other Liquid, and in a Different Form from the instituted One, would not this be to act contrary to the Order of the Church, and therefore of no Validity ? And will any sincere Man say, that Baptism so administered is the true Christian Baptism in the Sense of the Church of England ? And if it be not, then 'tis of no signification at all ; And if such Baptism which is done contrary to the prescrib'd Rule of the Church, (i. e. without the true Matter, and Form,) be Null, and Void, why is it not Null, and Void, when done by one who in the Sense of the Church is not the proper Administrator, (because as the Article expresses it,) *He is not lawfully called, and sent to execute the same* ? But to go on with our Articles. Our Church declares Article 26th. that the Person before spoken of, who is lawfully called, and sent, *does not minister the Sacraments in his own Name, but in Christ's, and by his Commission, and Authority, and that the Sacraments be effectual, because of Christ's Institution, and Promise.* Where you see again, that the Church of England allows none but a commissioned Officer to administer the Sacrament of Baptism, or perform any other Ministerial Act ; he therefore that Baptizes without having first received Ordination from a Bishop whom Christ has authorized to send Ministers, and Labourers into his Vineyard, such an unauthoriz'd Person acts not in Christ's Name, but his Own ; How then can we hope for any Share of Christ's

H

Pro-

Promise to attend his pretended Baptism? How can he expect that Christ should bless his unauthoriz'd Act? How can he ever imagine, that Christ should make that to be good, valid Baptism, which is not done according to his own Institution? A Commission is so necessary to make publick Acts valid, that the want of that intirely vacates and renders them ineffectual.

To make this most evident to the meanest Capacities, I will here put a familiar Case which relates to civil Government, 'tis obvious to all, that no Man can act as a Justice of Peace without the Queen's Commission. Now suppose Mr. *Shaw* being very sensible, as no doubt he is, of his extraordinary merit, should act as one of her Majesties Justices of the Peace without a Commission, and should as occasion serv'd, commit Offenders to Prison by the regular Form of a Mittimus, would he not be severely blamed, for this Officiousness? Would he not be call'd a conceited Usurper? And upon Complaint to her Majesty, would he not be most sharply reprimanded for his Impudence, and Presumption, and perhaps punish'd too according to Desert? Would not all the Acts he did without Commission be declared Null, and Void? Must not the Offenders he had sent to Prison, be brought under a fresh Enquiry, and Examination, before an authoriz'd Justice? And if Mr. *Shaw* should demand a Reason of all this Procedure, and ask why he might not do Service to the Queen; and Country, being a Man of unquestionable Abilities; would it not be answer'd immediately, that her Majesty had already nominated so many for this County, and by Charter appointed so many for this Borough, and consequently that all others to whom her Commission is not granted, are excluded? The Application is very easy. If any acts in Christ's spiritual Government, the Church with-

out

out Commission, (as I have prov'd the Dissenting Teachers do) what he does is *in his own Name, and not in Christ's*, and therefore he cannot expect that Christ should confirm it ; on the contrary, he has the greatest Reason to believe that he looks upon it as a Nullity, nay he may assure himself, that Christ is highly displeased at this Usurpation, and will, (unless Repentance prevent it) severely punish him for it.

The 27th Article affirms that *' Baptism is not only a Sign of Profession, and Mark of Difference whereby Christian Men are discerned from others that be not Christned : But it is also a Sign of Regeneration, or New Birth, whereby, as by an Instrument, they that receive Baptism Rightly are grafted into the Church, the Promises of Forgiveness of Sin, and of our Adoption to be the Sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly sign'd and seal'd.* Since then by Baptism there is a Stipulation, Covenant, or Agreement made with God, and our Baptism is the Instrument, the visible Sign and Seal of that Agreement, so that by Virtue of it, we are entituled to God's Promises ; I would fain know how it is possible, for any one to act for God, and to sign, and Seal for him, as his Lawful Agent, and Attorney, but he that has God's Commission ; and from whom can Baptism be received Rightly, but from him God has Sent ?

Nay, so far is our Church from allowing any Person, to transact between God, and Man, as a Minister, without a lawful Call, that as it most plainly appears from the 37th Article, She does not allow even the Sovereign Princes of the Realm, *the Minist'ring either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify.* Which Words are so plain, they need no Comment. If then the supreme Govern-

nour of the Kingdom is not permitted, for want of Ordination, to act as God's spiritual Minister, how much less a Lay-Subject!

So that to Sum up all that has been urg'd upon this last Head, in a few Words, the Sense of the Church of England is this, that none can administer the Sacraments, [of which Baptism is one] except he be lawfully called, and sent, that what such an authorized Person does, is in Christ's Name, and by Virtue of Christ's Commission, and as Baptism is a Stipulation, Contract, Covenant, or Agreement made with God, by his Agent or lawful Attorney, (because it is impossible to treat immediately with God who is the Principal.) The Signing and Sealing of the Instrument must be performed with, and by God's deputed and commissioned Officer; So that the Greatest Princes, and Sovereigns cannot execute the Office without a Previous, Right, Episcopal Ordination. For as the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, *No Man taketh this Honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron, Heb. 5 c. 4. v.* Thus then we see, how the Case stands with Regard to the Articles. Now to know who is that Lawful Minister who is qualified to Baptize, the Church of England elsewhere informs us; thus in the Preface of the Book of Ordination, She expressly assures us that *it is evident unto all Men diligently Reading Holy Scriptures, and Antient Authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons. And therefore no Man shall be accounted, or taken to be a Lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he has had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.* And accordingly, it is very observable, that the French Ministers who are come hither, are

not

not permitted to officiate as Priests, or Deacons in our Church, till they have been ordained by a Bishop, none is allow'd to have cure of Souls, till he has produced his Episcopal Orders. And if you enquire of those *French Gentlemen*, who are benefitted in this Country, they will tell you by what Bishops they were ordained, and particularly that the late Bishop of London, [*Dr. Compton*] ordained many of the Refugees who came hither. So that it is very apparent who is a *Lawful Minister*, and that by that Expression, the Church of England understands one who has received Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination. Agreeably hereto is the 30th Canon of our Church, which shows us that a *Lawful Minister* is required to render *Baptism Perfect and Valid*. 'For when the Minister dipping the Infant in Water, or laying Water upon the Face of it, (as the Manner also is,) hath pronounced these Words, *I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the Infant is fully, and perfectly Baptized*. So that here you also see, the Administrator, the Matter, and Form are all mentioned as so equally Necessary to complete Baptism, that if any one be wanting, the Baptism is not *Full and Perfect*.

But if the person be Baptized by the Right Administrator, *i. e.* a *Lawful Episcopal Minister*, with the Matter, *i. e.* Water, and with the right Form, *i. e.* in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, then and not till then, he is *Fully and Perfectly Baptiz'd*, 'So as the Sign of the Cross being afterwards used, doth neither add any thing to the Virtue, and Perfection of Baptism, nor being omitted doth detract any thing from the Effect, and Substance of it. As it follows in the same Paragraph of that Canon. The 69th Canon strictly Commands every Minister that is duly without any

Manner of Collusion, informed of the Weakness, and Danger of Death, of any Infant unbaptized in his Parish, to go where the Infant is, to Baptize it, and if the Infant happen to die, thro' his Neglect, he shall be suspended for three Months. In which Canon it is very remarkable, that if the Minister should neglect his Duty, there is no command, no not so much as a bare Permission granted to the Lay-Father, or Friend, or Midwife, to Baptize the Child, even in a Case of the greatest Danger: All the Direction is, that the Minister of the Parish shall be sent for, (as the Rubrick before the Office of private Baptism informs us,) or in his Absence any other Lawful Minister, that can be procur'd: But if no such Lawful Minister can be procur'd, there is not the least Intimation that any Layman, or Woman present shall Baptize it.

That the Church of *England* thinks that the Administrator is of the Essence of Baptism as well as the Matter, and Form, is evident from another Rubrick in the said Office of private Baptism, which runs thus, '*But if the Child were Baptiz'd by any other Lawful Minister; then the Minister of the Parish where the Child was Born, or Christened, shall examine, and try whether the Child be Lawfully Baptized, or no.* Now this he does, by asking 1st. whether the Child was Baptized by a proper Officer, or commissioned Administrator, 'By whom was this Child Baptized, and then with what Matter, was this Child Baptized, with what Words was this Child Baptized?' So that here the Minister of the Parish makes Enquiry, whether the Baptism which was administered in his Absence, was administered by a *Lawful Minister*, who is an Essential Agent in Baptism, and whether there were the Essential Parts used, viz. The instituted Matter, viz. Water, and the Form, in the Name of the Father, &c.

But

But now if in the Sense of the Church of England, any Lay-Person may Baptize, and such Baptism is valid, pray, why does She require that the Office shall be performed by a *Lawful Minister*? Why must the Minister of the Parish demand, '*By whom was this Child Baptiz'd, in his Absence?*' And if upon Examination he finds that the Baptism was not administered by a *Lawful Minister* of the Church, how can he, with Truth, certify the Congregation, *that in that Case, all is well done, and according unto due Order, concerning the Baptizing of that Child*; When at the same time he says so, his Conscience gives him the Lye, because he knows that the Person who pretended to Baptize, is not a *Lawful Minister, nor ever had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination*. In a Word, what tends to put this Matter out of all Dispute, is this Consideration, were there no other besides, to Wit, that the Rubrick in K. Edward the Sixth's Common Prayer-Book, which seems to be penn'd with too great a Latitude, was altered after the *Hampton-Court* Conference, to what it now is, on purpose to prevent all Lay-Ministrations, as shall be more at large spoken to hereafter. From all that has been said, I hope, it fully appears, who are *Lawful Ministers*, and the proper Administrators of Baptism.

Since then Baptism is Valid, when administered by a *Lawful Episcopal Minister*, as before explained, it must consequently be Invalid, when administered by one who is no *Lawful Minister*, but a Layman, or Woman, because, as the Bishop of Oxford* very rightly observes * (b) '*There is no Magis, et Minus in the Validity, or Invalidity of Sacraments, which cannot be partly Valid, partly Invalid.*' (a) Even

* See his Lordship's Margin Note, P. 14 of his Charge at Oxford. (b)

(2) Even *Necessity cannot make Sacraments Valid, if an Essential of a Sacrament be wanting. Necessity may excuse an Irregularity, or the Absence of something relating to the benefit of a Sacrament, but not to the esse of it. If the Administrator be of the esse of the Sacrament of Baptism, (as I have before prov'd he is,) Necessity can not make that Baptism, where there is not a proper Administrator, Valid; than it can that, where either the Matter, or the Form, the Water, or the Words are not used. And now if the Necessity cannot make unauthoriz'd Baptisms Valid, how much less must such unauthorized Lay-Baptisms be Valid, which have no Necessity to plead for them, but are done in Affront to, and Contempt of Episcopacy.*

And thus having shewn that to make Baptism Valid, it must be administered by a proper Administrator, *i. e.* a Clergyman, and that a Dissenting-Teacher, or any other Lay-Person is not that proper Administrator, and consequently that such Administrations are Null, and Void, I leave it to the unprejudic'd, impartial Reader to Judge whether what I have said, does not fully prove that the pretended Baptisms of Mr. *Shaw*, and other Lay-Baptizers are Invalid; and if so, his mighty Argument drawn from the Opinion of a few, is of no Force against Scriptura, Antiquity, and the Church of England; to say Nothing of the Reform'd beyond Seas, the old Puritans, the present Kirk of Scotland, and the Dissenting Teacher's Subscription to the 23d Article, all which I have made appear, are on my Side in this particular. So that the Dissenters are Self-condemned.

But least Mr. *Shaw*, and his Admirers should be so vain as to imagine, (as I hear they do) that his late Performance is unanswerable. I am therefore resolv'd to shew upon how sandy a Foundation

tion such an overweening Conceit is built, and will follow our Author Step by Step thro' his boasted Work. After he had made a Flourish with his Authorities he borrows from the Bishop of Oxford's Charge, (which I have spoken to already, and observ'd how unconvulsive that way of Arguing is, and shewn that an Argument of that Nature makes plainly against him,)

He proceeds P. 4. to say in the Bishop of Sarum's Words, * *that this [i. e. the Validity of Lay-Baptisms] has been the constant Sense of the Church for above Fourteen Hundred Years.* But now if his Lordship, or his Second, Mr. Shaw, had prov'd that the whole Church was of that Opinion, it had been very much to the Purpose. I believe I may safely affirm, that Mr. Shaw (not to say his Lordship) can never prove that Point.

That some particular Churches did allow the Validity of some Lay-Baptisms, I make no Scruple to grant : But that the Catholick Church was of that Opinion I utterly deny ; nay, that the Church of Christ in General, did condemn, and annul Lay-Baptisms, The Learned Dr. Brett has, I think clearly made appear, in his late Book, Entituled, *An Enquiry into the Judgment, and Practice of the Catholick, Primitive Church* ; which, he particularly does, P. 32. from St. Jerom's Dialogue with the *Luciferian*. The Apostolical Constitutions which are very anient, and give an Account of the Primitive Discipline, and Practice, do plainly assert, that it is so far from being Lawfull for Laicks to Baptize, that it was not permitted even to those Laymen who attended the Service of the Church ; but was a Power belonging *only* to Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. [L. 3. C. XI. Apostol. Constit.] †

As

* In his Lordship's Sermon at Salisbury, Nov. 7. 1714.
† See *Suicrum* in the Place above cited.

As to his Lordship's Charge, that this 'Conceit (as he is pleased to term it,) *thinks* such as are washed by Laymen, to be *no better than Heathens*, I answer that the Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism have the Charity to believe, that God will make great Allowances to those Persons, who in other Countries, or formerly in our own, were not so happy as to receive the true Episcopal Baptism ; they very heartily lament their Misfortunes, (as all good Men ought to do) and are well assur'd that God is not tied to his Institutes, tho' he has tied *Us*, and therefore where Men had not an Opportunity of receiving the True, Episcopal Baptism, or were Ignorant of the Want of it, and believed the Baptism they had received, was Good and Valid, and lived according to the Laws of the Gospel ; it is to be hop'd, that a God of Infinite Mercy, will consider, and reward their pious Intentions accordingly ; for it is not I believe, the mere Want of Baptism, but the wilful Slight, and Contempt of it, when it may be had, and *especially* when it is offered, that Risques a Man's Eternal Salvation. Why may not such Persons as believe Christianity, and Practice the Duties of it, and would have true Episcopal Baptism if they could, or were made sensible of their Obligation to receive it, Why, I say, might not, and may not, such, be esteem'd as the *Catechumens* in the Primitive Church? Who, tho' they died, (as some certainly did,) before they had received Baptism, yet because they conducted their Lives, conformably to Christianity, and did intend to be admitted into the Baptismal Covenant, when an Opportunity should offer it self, the Church therefore did believe, that *God would shew them Mercy*, and the same Mercy, I trust, God will shew to such who either here or elsewhere never had the Benefit of true Baptism, for since the neglect of it was not their own, but their

their Parent's Fault, or the Circumstances of Time, and Place, were, or are, such, as make Necessity Pleadable, I say in Cases of that Nature, my Charity inclines me to hope the best, and I leave such to God's uncovenanted Mercy; to a Mercy that is Infinite, to a Goodness that is beyond Expression.

As to the Case of Heretical Baptisms, tho' there was a Dispute concerning their Validity, (in which, by the Way, it is thought by some, that *St. Cyprian* and his Collegues had the Advantage of *Stephen Bishop of Rome*, and his Adherents,) yet under Favour, what Relation has that Dispute of Heretical Baptisms, to this of unauthorized Lay-Baptisms? Were not many of those Heretical, or Schismatical Bishops, and Priests Episcopally, and truly Ordain'd? Might not then perhaps, their Ministrations be Valid, tho' irregular? What Wonder is it, that some Churches did allow the Validity of such Episcopal Baptisms? and where is the just Consequence that *Presbyterian Lay-Baptism* is Valid? If the Dissenting-Teachers had been Ordain'd by Bishops, as those Heretical, or Schismatical Bishops, and Priests were, then indeed this Instance our Author quotes from his Lordship's Sermon would have been something to the Purpose, but since there is a vast Difference between those Episcopal Baptizers formerly, [who were out of the Church,] and the Lay-Baptizers now, it can be of no Service to these Modern Usurpers upon the Rights of the Clergy?

Well! But to support the sinking Cause; He urges the Authority of that Learned Body, the University of *Oxford*, (tho' neither he, nor his Party can give the Universities a good Word on other Occasions,) and tells us P. 5. What the Bishop of *Oxford* had told us in his Charge before, viz. That the said Learned Body allows the Validity of Lay-Baptism, as says he, appears in their Letter

1998年12月

the Dissenters. for their Separation, and Judge it to be Schismatical. * But that I suppose Mr. Shaw will never mention, for a very obvious Reason, because it condemns him, and his Followers. But to return. That the World may see, how far that University is from deserving so foul an Imputation as that of Countenancing the Lay-Baptismations which are so frequently practiced by Uriters, I desire it may be observ'd, that that University, as I am well assur'd lately honoured a certain Gentleman with the Degree of Master of Arts for Writing some excellent Treatises against the Validity of Dissenters, and other Lay-Baptisms; so that from all this 'tis very apparent, what little Reason some Men have to say that the University of Oxford patronizes their truly Popish Nation.

But our Compiler returns to the Bishop of Sarum, and tells us (what most People knew before) that his Lordship assures the World in his famous mournful Preface, that it is not only his Opinion, but the Opinion of all men, as now call'd Low-Church-Men, that Lay-Baptism is Valid.

' They dare not, says he, Unbaptize all the Bodies of Protestants beyond Sea, nor deny so our Dissenters at home, the federal Rites common to all Christians, or leave them to uncovered Abhorcy. They don't annul their Baptisms, or think that they ought to be Baptiz'd again, in any regular manner, before they can be accounted Christians. What the Opinion of the Low-Churchmen is in this Case, I am not concern'd

to

* So their Forefathers at Geneva, and other places condemn'd the Separation in England, as I have shewn above. When at the Synod of Dort, the Bishop of Landaff spoke of Episcopal Government, &c. Bogermanus the President of that Assembly stood up and said, Domine non sumus adeo felices, Alas! My Lord, we are not so happy, &c. Bishop Hall, 66. P.

to enquire after, and therefore am willing to take his Lordship's Word, not doubting his exact knowledge of, and acquaintance with, both *Them*, and *their Principles*. And if this *conceit* of the *Validity* of *Lay-Baptism*, must be made a *Criterion*, or in plain *English* an *Eat-mark*, whereby we must know a Low-Churchman, I am content it shall be so, as his Lordship puts it. But what are we to understand by a Low-Churchman, *reserves a part*? Is the Low Churchman *One* that wishes to see the Church in a *Low Condition*? If he does, I trust, God will never gratify his Eyes with that Sight any more. It is Foreign to my present Subject to consider, that unhappy distinction of Churchmen into *High*, and *Low*, which I doubt not, was made by the *Enemies* of our Church. to divide us among our selves, and so bring *that Ruin* upon our *Constitution*, which by their *own Strength*, and *numbers*, they are not able to effect. Notwithstanding the many *Calumnies*, *Slanders*, and *Reproaches*, which are cast upon those who are call'd *High-Churchmen*, I cannot find, that they hold any *Principles*, but what the *Church of England* herself avows; they are cordial, well affected *Friends* of the Church, heartily concern'd for her *Prosperity* and *Welfare*, and upon all occasions act for her *Interest*; they ever have been, and ever will be found, in all those measures that make for Her *advantage* and *Security*; their *Zeal*, and concern for the *Salvation* of Men's Souls is such, that whether the *Dissenters will bear*, or *whether they will forbear*, (as the expression in the *Prophet* is) they will *honestly* and *plainly* tell them the *Danger* of *Damnation*, they incur by their *Unwarrantable Schism*, and will use all *Endeavours* to bring them to a *Conviction*, and
Sense

Sense of their Errors. They don't *show Pillows under every Armhole, nor cry Peace, where there is no Peace* : They know what the true Moderation is, the Gospel requires, and practice it. But as for that *scandalous Indifferency, and Laodicean Lukewarmness* some have Baptized with the Venerable Name of *Moderation*, they know God condemns *that* as a Sin, and will *Spue* such as are *neither hot nor cold, but Lukewarm out of his Mouth.* Rev, 3 c. 16. v.

They halt not between two Opinions ; nor, by impracticable Comprehensions, endeavour to melt down the Church into Presbytery ; as they are *in* the Church, so they are sincerely *for* the Church. As for those who are called Low-Churchmen, I charitably hope, there may be *some*, who are true Church-men, however they are distinguished by that Title, for Names are very often fixed *Undeservedly*, according to the World's Caprice, and Pleasure. But yet if we consider the Generality of such as call themselves Low-Church-Men, and pride themselves in that Title, we shall find that we have but too much Reason to beg of God, ever to preserve his Church out of the Hands of such *Low-Church-Men*. Some of which are so *Low*, that they seldom, or never come to Church at all, to worship that God who dwells on *High*, but *Wretchedly, and Scandalously*, in Contempt of all Laws, Divine, and humane, mispend the Lord's-Day, and let slip those gracious Opportunities which God affords, of Prayer, Receiving the Lord's Supper, and hearing the Word, which are some of the Means he has appointed for our Salvation.

And of those who more frequently tread the Courts of the Lord's House, it is very observable, that they behave themselves with great Indecency, have a mean Esteem of the Liturgy, and retain so little Veneration for the Christian Priesthood, that the Clergy are the constant Subject-Matter

of

of their Ridicule, and Divotion. It would astonish a Man to hear their bitter Railings, and horrid Curses and Imprecations they plentifully pour out at their Factionous Entertainments, and drunken Revels; as the Characters of the Clergy are thus daily stab'd; so their Persons have been, and are ill treated; and all Endeavours us'd to bring them into Contempt; and the illiterate Sons of Dirt and Corruption, Beggars, and Banditti are encouraged to affront and despise them. The Sacerdotal Powers are little accounted of, and 'tis made a Matter of Indifferency, whether their Children be Baptiz'd by the Minister of the Parish, or a Dissenting Teacher; some have argued that the Dissenting Teachers are as true ministers of Christ, as the Clergy of the Church of England. They can see no Schism in the Sectaries. Nor make any Scruple to go to Conventicles. The Power of the Keys, Excommunication, and Absolution are ridicul'd to an high Degree, and represented as Popery. The Independency of the Church on the State, as to her purely spiritual Powers, and a proper commemorative Sacrifice in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are affirmed to be Innovations. Many look upon Episcopacy not to be of Divine Right, but an humane Institution only, which may be altered when the State pleases. And tho' our Church, conformably to the Scripture, asserts expressly in her Homilies, the Primitive Doctrine of *Non-Resistance*, and *Passive-Obedience*, and that Princes are accountable to none but God, yet these Low Church-Men affirm the contrary, and argue for the Lawfulness of *Resistance*, when our Sovereign Lords the People please to fancy that *His Majesty*, (whom God long preserve,) does not Govern according to Law. And tho' Her Government is the most Mild and Gentle that can be wished for, tho' Her Ministers are the most Able,

Able, and Experienc'd, and study the true Interest of our Country, yet these I now speak of, are daily impudently charging them with Mal-Administration, and Endeavouring to poison the Minds of the Queen's Subjects with *Seditious Principles*, to prepare them for *Rebellion*. And for what End is all this Endeavour, unless it be, to change our *Ancient Monarchy* into a *Commonwealth*, or to set up another *Oliver*?

In a Word, * in all Elections, these *Low-Church-Men* generally join with the *Dissenters* in Opposition to those worthy Gentlemen who are particularly distinguishable for their sincere Affection to the Church, and unshaken Loyalty to the Crown. But to return from this seasonable design'd Digression, to the Argument in Hand.

How do the Assertors of the Invalidity, of *Lay-Baptism Uncurch* the Protestants beyond Seas! If they will not have Episcopacy when they may, If they will not accept of Episcopal Ordination, when they have had Opportunities for it, is not the Fault their own? Don't they then *Uncurch* themselves? Episcopacy is, either the true Instituted Government, which ought to be in Christ's Church, or it is not, if it be, as has been by many clearly prov'd, then why must *We* be blam'd, and reprov'd for want of Charity for asserting it, and Endeavouring to persuade all to submit to it. Is there not a Regard to be had to Truth? Is it not the truest and greatest Charity in the World to let Men know their Errors, and Defects? And are not *Those* who Perform that charitable Office, their *Real and best Friends*? We are told by *Solomon*, who was a very Wise Man, that *He that rebukes his Friend, shall afterwards find more Favour, than he who*

* Deists, Freethinkers, Latitudinarians, Sectaries join together in Elections, &c. against the Church.

who flattereth with his Tongue, Prov. 28. c. 23. v. And a Man that flattereth his Neighbour, spreadeth a Net for his Feet. Prov. 29. c. 5. v. It would certainly be the best Evidence of true Respect, and unfeigned Charity, if those who wrack their Invention to make Salvos, and Excuses for the Opposers of Episcopacy, would be pleased to make that good Use of their Friendship, and Correspondence with them, as to let them know the heinous Guilt they contract, and the Danger they incur, by their Usurpation upon the Priesthood, and so urge them with the most powerful Arguments, to procure a true Ordination. But if *They* be resolved to prefer their own Fancies to the General Sense of the Christian World, and will reject that Government which continued from the Apostles Days, for 1500 Years without a Rival. If they will presume to act in Opposition to Episcopacy, without a Commission, the Fault is doubtless chargeable upon their own Heads, and if they be *Unchurched*, they must blame themselves for it. * *For my Part, I can no more help it than I can that the Dissenters are Schismatics, that the Arians, and Socinians are Hereticks, or that the Jews, and Turks, and Heathens are no Christians; and these have as much Reason to be angry, and think Me Uncharitable, because I affirm, that Unity is a Gospel Duty, and Schism is a Sin, that Jesus Christ is God blessed for ever, that the Christian Religion is true, and that Christ is the true Messias.* But to recommend this New Notion the better of the Validity of Lay-Baptism Mr. *Shaw* insinuates that the last Convocation did determine this Point in Favour of his Lay Ministrations, What! if a select Number of B——ps did meet at a certain Palace, What! if they did sign a Paper or Declaration whereby they

* See Mr. Agates plain Truth; i. Par. 109 P.

they acknowledge the Validity of Lay-Baptism, would such a Declaration as this, if it were so, amount to any thing more than an Expression of their private Sentiments? Can any Man look upon *this* as an Act of an *English* Convocation? Or suppose the upper House of Convocation, *i. e.* The Majority of the Bishops, did pass it in the Affirmative, *'That such Persons as have been already Baptized in, or with Water, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, ought not to be Baptized again.* Must this Opinion of their Lordships be call'd the Judgment of the Church of *England*? Must such a Declaration as this be call'd the Declaration of the Church of *England*, since the Lower House of Convocation gave no Assent to it, nor ever made that Declaration a publick Act of Synod? The Lower House of Convocation reject-ed the Declaration, and acquainted the Upper House, that one Reason of their Refusal was, *'Because of the Inconveniencies manifestly attending such a Declaration, especially at a Time when the Authority of the Christian Priesthood was openly struck at by Some, and the Advantage of an Episcopal Mission so much undervalued by Others.'* So that the Declaration Mr. Shaw Mentions, is still but the private Opinion of some Bishops, and till it can be proved to be the *Real* Judgment of the Church of *England*, or of the Catholick, *i. e.* Universal Church, *Those* who differ from it do not deserve the black Character *They* are branded with, nor ought to be charged with, either *Donatism*, or *Anabaptism*.

In a Word, there is no Observation our Author has made, that can Justify his *Short, Positive, Groundless Conclusion*, P. 6. *'The Universal Church has allowed the Validity of Baptisms performed by*

K 2

Per

* See History of the present Parliament 3. Session.

'sons not Ordained by Diocesan Bishops, till within a very few Tears.

But here I ask this *short, positive* Assertion, what he means by the *Universal Church*? If he means the Church of Christ in General, (as the Expression plainly intimates,) why did he not produce the Authorities of the antient Fathers? The reason is very obvious and plain, because, he could not. If he means the particular Church of *England*, by *Universal Church*, which by the by, would be Nonsense. I defy him to shew where our Church has allow'd the *Validity of Lay-Baptism*; our Church is so far from countenancing any such Practice, or Opinion, that, as it appears from Her Rubricks, Articles, and Canons, She confines the Administration of Baptism to a *Lawful Minister*, and whom She means by a *Lawful Minister*, Herself explains in the Preface before Ordination; *viz.* One who has receiv'd Episcopal Consecration or Ordination. With what Face then can this Gentleman assert, (as He plainly does,) *'that the Universal Church* (in what Sense soever he understands the Expression) *'has allowed the Validity of Baptisms performed by Persons not ordained by Diocesan Bishops, till within a very few Tears.* I wonder I say how he dares affirm so false a Thing as this. But this is not the only Falshood which will appear in his Book,

As for the Charge he quotes from the Bishop of *Salisbury*, upon the late *most Learned Mr. Dodwell*, (as Mr. Shaw supposes his Lordship means) I cannot but think it very *severe*; not to say, *highly punishable*. What is become of the *boasted Moderation* now? Why must Mr. Dodwell, a Person of such strict Piety, and great Learning, be stil'd a Corrupter of the Faith, and Church, and be term'd almost an Atheist, for asserting only what the

Famous * *Mr. Milton, Mr. Baxter, and Mr. Robert Fleming* have also done. If *Mr. Dodwell* was mistaken in some particular Tenets, a little of that Moderation which has been so plentifully measured out to Hetericks and Schismatics, &c. would induce One surely to hope, he had no Intention to promote Atheism. But he is not the only Person who has received hard Names, and ill Usage; † *Bp. Jewel, K. Charles 1. Arch Bishop Laud, Dr. Montague*, with many others both formerly, and of late, have suffered, and do suffer, in their Characters, and Circumstances. As to what is observ'd from the Learned *Mr. Hooker*, His Assertion is without any Proof, and shews only his private Opinion, to which I have spoken already, and proved it is not conclusive. And the Reason [why he and many others, who lived nearer the time of the Reformation, and asserted the Validity of such unauthorized Lay Baptisms, was, because *that* Opinion was early instill'd into 'em, and propagated by the *Papists*, and was one of those *Papist* Notions which continued for some time; for it is not to be expected, that Reformation can be perfected at once, nor that settled Principles should be rooted out of Men's Minds in an Instant.

The *Romanists* had all along maintain'd and continue to do, that Baptism is so absolutely necessary to Salvation, that if a Child should happen to die without it, it is excluded the Kingdom of Heaven, wherefore the Church of *Rome* allows a Lay-Man, or Midwife, to sprinkle a Child that is in

* See Rehearsal 2 Vol. 37. 2.

See *Baxter's Dying Thoughts*. P. 32. 139. 145.

See *Fleming's Christology*. printed here. 1705. P. 65. 66.

† See *Bp. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*. Pr. P. 2.

See *Dr. Brett's Sermon*. May 29. 1712. at *St. James's Cha.* P. 10.

See *Histories of Rebellion against K. Charles 1st.*

See *Dr. Sacheverell's Trial*.

in Danger; What Wonder is it then that our first Reformers, and the Generation that succeeded, should Fall into the same Opinion, and out of a Mistaken Charity, allow of such *Lay-Practices*. Baptism is necessary where it can be had, but where it cannot, our Church thinks it both more Justifiable, and safer, to trust God with a Child, than to permit Lay Men to do such Acts they have no Commission for, nor any Grounds from Scripture, or the most early Antiquity, to believe, he will ratifie and confirm. Nay considering that such Lay-act is a downright Forgery, a Counterfeiting God's Seal, and a palpable Lye, there is all imaginable Reason to conclude that God is so highly displeased with it, that he will not confirm it, but will save such Child, by an uncovenanted Mercy. Whether Mr. *Shaw* has any just Reason to affirm, as he does, P. 7. that our Church does not *invalidate* his Baptisms, nor *censure* him, and his Brethren as no *Lawful Ministers*, I leave the Reader to Judge, from what I have observed before, when I shew'd the Sense of the Church of England in the former Part of this Discourse.

The next thing I am to consider, is, what our Transcriber calls a *Demonstration*, but I believe, it will not prove to be a *Mathematical one*, when discuss'd; and that is an Instance he borrows from the Bishop of Oxford's Charge, viz. King *James* 1st who was of Opinion, (if you will believe Mr. *Shaw*;) that *Presbyterian* Teachers ought to be reckon'd *Lawful Ministers*. But how does this appear? Did he affirm any such thing: And if he had, would his affirmation have amounted to a full Proof? Would his Opinion have overbalanced the Authority of Scripture, Antiquity, and the Church of England? Certainly it would not. But to the point. The Opinion here refer'd to, is that, King *James* deliver'd at the *Hampton-Court Conference*

ference, (which was begun *January* * 12th, 1603.) which now lies before me, but from *That*, our Author's cause, receives small support, when 'tis consider'd that His Majesty declar'd expressly against the practise of *Lay-Baptism*; and as Dr. Barlow, then Dean of *Chester*, who gives account of that Conference, tells us, ' *The King utterly dislik'd, that any but a Lawful Minister should Baptize, and in this point his Highness grew somewhat earnest against the Baptizing by Women, and Laicks,* (See P. 8. of the Conference) and again, p. 17. of the same.) ' *His Majesty so expounded Baptism, that it was necessary to be bad, where it might be Lawfully bad: i. e. Ministred by Lawful Ministers, by whom alone, and by no private Person, He thought it might not in any Case be Administred.* So that 'tis abundantly plain, that the King Condemn'd *Lay Baptism*. And because some *Laymen*, and *Midwives*, had presum'd to sprinkle Children in cases of extreme necessity, and danger, being perhaps encourag'd thereto, by the *Ambiguity* of the Rubrick, therefore to prevent such like practices for the future, it was order'd, as the result of that Consultation, (p. 18. confer.) that the Rubrick should be made more clear; and express, which was accordingly done, pursuant to the Kings Opinion, and the Words *Lawful Minister* were inserted, so that whatever the Practice was before, it is certain it was then *Condemn'd* and *Prohibited* for the future by that Alteration. Nay before that Conference was held, and Alteration made, *Lay-Baptism* was not allow'd, for Dr. *Whitgift* Archbishop of *Canterbury* shew'd ' *His Majesty, that the Administation of Baptism by Women, and Lay-Persons, was not allow'd in the Practice of the Church, but enquired of by Bishops*

* Jan: 14th. says, Sr. Rich: Baker, in his Chronicle P. 444

Bishops, in their Visitations, and censur'd, neither do the Words in the Book, (i. e. the Rubrick in the Office of Private Baptism) infer any such meaning. (p. 14. Confer.) But to return to that Learned King. If he afterwards deliver'd an Opinion inconsistent with the former, I appeal to any impartial Man, which of the two Opinions is to be prefer'd. As to what is hinted, that if that King denied the Validity of *Presbyterian Baptism*, He *Unchristian'd* his own Children, I have only this at present to say to it, that it will be a very difficult task for any *Dissenter* to prove, that they had no other than *Presbyterian Lay-Baptism*. And if it could be prov'd, their misfortune could not make this Principle *false*, I now maintain. For to argue from Fact to *Right*, and that because a Thing has been done, therefore it ought to be done, is a very wrong and unconvulsive Way of Arguing.

But what relates to the Baptism of the King's Children shall be consider'd in a more proper Place. The next Thing which Mr. *Shaw* styles a *Demonstration*, is a Passage he quotes from a small Pamphlet, call'd, *A Dissuasive from Jacobitism*, which with great Confidence asserts many Things, but proves Nothing at all. And as it is written by One who has no quarrel with *Presbytery*, to be sure he will say what he is able in its Favour. He affirms without a *Blush* (such is the *Thicknes* of some *Faces*) *That from the Reformation to the Restoration Presbyterian Ordination was allowed of, and practised in the Church of England.* What a *Monstrous, Palpable Fallhood* is this! Why did not the *Worthy Author* of this *Great Performance* produce some *Authorities* to support so bold an Assertion? What! Does he and his Admirer Mr. *S.* call the *Muck-Ordinations* performed by *Baxter, Hughes, and Bowles*, the *Ordinations of the Church of England*?

gland ? Are they so *Singular* as to imagine that
Church and Schism are Terms *Synonymous* and *Con-*
vertible ? Do they think to palm such *Nonsense*
 as *this* upon the World ? Is it not evident that
 the Church of *England* is *Episcopal* ? Is it not plain,
 that she allows none to be a Minister unless he has
 had *Episcopal* Consecration or Ordination ? Are
 not the *French Gentlemen* living Testimonies of
this ? Are not they ordained by a Bishop before
 they Officiate in the Church ? How can it then
 with Truth, be affirmed, as it is, that ' *the Valid-*
ty of the Ordinations of Foreign Protestant Chur-
ches was always allowed of. If the Church look'd
 upon *their* Ordination by Presbyters to be Valid;
 why then does she require them to be ordain'd
 again, when they come hither ? So that in this
 Quotation Mr. *Shaw* has made, tho' it consists of
 six Lines only, it yet contains *two downright*
Falshoods. Well ! But, says he, ' *several Bishops*
were made of such as were never ordain'd Priests
by Bishops. And suppose they were. Don't the
 higher Orders always include the lower Orders ?
 Does not the Title of *Duke* always include the In-
 ferior Titles of *Earl*, and *Baron* ? 'Tis true indeed
 it has been the usual Method, and 'tis certainly
 the most *Regular*, to ordain Men *Deacons* and
Priests first, before they are consecrated Bishops
 but yet 'tis notorious that when Occasion required,
 some have been ordained Bishops who were not
 Clergymen before, by Virtue of which Ordinati-
 on, they were at one and the same time, vested
 with all the Power belonging to all the sacred
 Offices. Thus the Bishops in *England* in the Reign
 of *K. James I.* Ordained several Gentlemen of
Scotland Bishops, who were not *Priests* before; and
 sent them back with *Episcopal* Authority to ordain
 there a *Lawful Ministry*. It must not be dissem-
 bled, that it was the Opinion of some, particular-
 ly

ly of Dr. *Andrews* then Bishop of *Ely*, that those Persons ought to be first ordain'd *Deacons*, and *Priests*. But being reminded that St. *Ambrose* of *Milain* was ordained a Bishop, tho' he was no Priest before, the Objection was urg'd no farther. How then does the Act of Consecration of the *Scottish* Bishops, which I suppose is hinted at, how I say does, *that* prove that our Bishops approved of *Presbyterian* Ordination! What my Adversary quotes from the Author of the *Exceptions*, &c. is but a dull Repetition of the same Thing, and which I have answered already; as I have also done that positive Assertion which concludes the Paragraph P. 8. For I have proved that the Church looks upon the *Administrator* to be of the *Essence* of Baptism as well as the *Matter* and *Form*, and orders the Minister of the Parish to try whether a Child be *Rightly* Baptiz'd, by asking first, 'By *whom* was *this Child Baptiz'd*, i. e. (Whether by some other Lawful Minister,) and then with *what Matter*, and *Form*.

Our Author proceeds P. 8. to '*shew from the Uncharitableness, and Absurdity of that Opinion which confines Baptism to Diocesan Ordination, that it must be False*.' But here again it is very Observable, that he advances not so much as One Argument to prove the Position, but cites only some positive Assertions of two Bishops before-mentioned; and which Assertions are much the same he has urg'd before, and have been by *Me* considered, in that Part *Particularly* where I shew the Charity of such as maintain the Invalidity of *Lay-Baptism*, so that what I there observe is a full Answer to Bishop *Burner's* Charge of *Uncharitableness*, which he says goes farther than *that* of the *Papists*, but the best of it is, he does not prove the Charge, and the Reason is, because he *cannot*.

What the Bishop of *Oxford* says is quoted P. 9.

is much to the same Purpose he affirms, (but does not prove,) that we *Unchristian the Reformed, many Martyrs, many thousands* of our own Church, and *those Glorious Confessors now in Gallies and Dungeons* : Besides King James the 1. his own Children, who, he says were Baptized by such, as had *only Presbyterian Orders in Scotland*. To all that *Fine* Declamation, what I have observed already, is a full and sufficient Answer ; I have proved that the Church has fix'd the *Premises*, and declar'd that even in Case of great Necessity, *Baptism* must be administred by *None* but a *Lawful Minister*, if then as * one expresses it, '*Baptism is absolutely necessary from a Lawful Hand, and a Lay-Hand be not a Lawful Hand, then Lay-Baptism is not the Baptism that is absolutely necessary : It must therefore be bad from an Hand that is Lawful.*

The *Premises* then being made, *Consequences* make themselves, and the more dreadful the *Consequences* are, the more it ought to be every Man's, Endeavour to avoid them.

But yet I demand how do we *Unchristian the Reformed* abroad ? If, (as I urg'd in the Case of Episcopacy,) they reject the *true Baptism* where it may be had, and with much *Less* Labour, and Trouble, than some are at, to fetch Riches from the *Indies* ? Is not the Fault their own ? Are not themselves chargeable with it ? Must we of the Clergy be so Complaisant to Men in Error, as to lay the Priesthood in *Common*, and undertake to reconcile *Inconsistencies* and *Contradictions* ? Would it not be much more becoming the *Sincerity* of our Profession to represent *decently*, and *honestly* the horrid Wickedness of Usurping the Ministry, and, as † the Priests did to K. *Uzziah*, to tell the Usur-

* See a Pamphlet, call'd the Judgment of the Church of England, P. 12. † 2, Chron : 26. c. 18. v.

pers. plainly, that the Sacred Office appertains not to them?

But after all, what an odd kind of argument is *this*, to make a Doctrine, *uncharitable* and *false*, because great numbers are involv'd in the sad Consequences of it.

According to this rate of reasoning, almost every Doctrine of the Gospel must be branded for *uncharitable* and *false*, for it is very certain that many *thousands* are involv'd in the Consequences. Must not the Clergy assert, and prove that *Murder*, *Adultery*, *Swearing*, *Drunkenness*, *Heresy*, and *Schism* are Sins, because many *thousands* are involv'd in the Consequences, and (without Repentance) will be Damn'd for them? Must we erase these Sins out of our Bibles, and strike them out of the Catalogue of Vices? Must not a Clergyman Preach Obedience to the supreme Power, and is it an *uncharitable* and *false* Doctrine, because it reproaches the Villains of 48, brands them with the infamous Character of Rebellion, nay, of Regicide, the very worst of Murders?

According to this *modern* way of arguing, the Christian Religion itself, (which the *Protestants* allow to be true, as well as we,) commends to be *uncharitable* and *false*, for how many *millions* of Souls are involv'd in the Consequences. What vast numbers are there, of *Jews*, *Turks*, and *Heathens*, that are not Christians? And may not they upbraid *some* with want of *Charity*, and *Moderation*? May not *they*, with equal truth and reason, argue with *them*, the *uncharitableness* and *falsehood* of Christianity, because if it be true, they are involv'd in *sad Consequences*. But let the Consequences be what they will, I dare say, Mr. *Blaue*, and others, will still affirm, that the Christian Religion is true, and that

that in the ordinary, reveal'd way, *there is no Salvation* promis'd, but to Christians, for as St. Peter tells us, *Acts 4. c. 12 v. There is none other Name*, but that of Christ, *given among Men, whereby we must be Saved*. We leave then such as are no Christians, to God's *uncovenanted* mercy, to a mercy which can make allowance for their unaffected ignorance, and want of the Opportunity of knowing the great truths of the Gospel; To a mercy that can Judge them by the Law of nature, and (to express my self in allusion to a Scripture-Phrase,) *will require no Brick, where he gives no Straw*. In short, according to this way of reasoning, none of this modern Principle will ever assert, the eternal Divinity of Jesus Christ; *God blessed for ever*, because the Guilt of *Heresy* will be thereby deriv'd, or charg'd upon all the *Arians* and *Sacrinians*, &c. both here, and in other places.

Let it therefore seem never so uncharitable to Doctrine, all true Christians must maintain it, that Christ, and the Holy Ghost are God, as well as the Father, whatever the Consequences may be.

As for those, who (as his Lordship expresses it) *have been Baptiz'd in their own Blood*, died in the *Galley* and *Dungeons*, for the sake of Religion, without true Baptism, they appear before a God who knows the hearts of all Men; who perfectly understands their pious intentions, sincere endeavours, and great readiness to receive Baptism, had they been bless'd with an Opportunity for that purpose; wherefore I am very much apt to believe, God will consider them accordingly, for, as I have said, God is not tied to his Institutes, tho' he has willed us.

That several Heathen Spectators of the Persecutions of Christians, were converted upon the Spot, and declar'd themselves Christ's Disciples; that they

were

were immediately put to Death for that Profession, before they could receive Baptism, the Histories of the Primitive Church inform us. And yet the *Catholicks* plac'd such in the rank of Catechumens, and doubted not but God would Compensate their Sufferings.

Whether King *James* the 1st. his Children were Baptiz'd, or no, it matters not with regard to the present Controversy; for the determination of it, depends not upon any occurrence that relates to them.

Suppose now that *they* had not been Baptiz'd at all, could the *Quakers* from thence, draw a Conclusive argument against Water-Baptism? Suppose they had not been Baptiz'd, till they arriv'd at *Years of Discretion*, would *this* have been a justification of the *Anabaptists* Contempt of *Infant-Baptism*? Suppose that King, compell'd by necessity, or out of choice, did procure his Children to be Sprinkled by a *Presbyterian-Teacher*, would it follow from thence, that *Presbyterian* Ordination is Valid? And the Baptism Valid, perform'd by a pretended *Presbyter*.

Is *this* to be accounted *Truth*, that *Error*, *this* good, *that* evil, *this* Lawful, *that* unlawful, in its own nature, which a King is pleas'd to declare so? So false, you see, is that *modern* way of arguing, from Practice.

But since his Lordship affirms so positively, that the Children of that Learned King were Baptiz'd 'by *Ministers, who had only Presbyterian Orders in Scotland*; one would expect his Lordship, or this *Dissenting-Teacher* Mr. *Shaw*; should produce some unquestionable Authorities to prove the truth of the assertion; and *directly* to demonstrate it to be a matter of Fact; but not so much as *one* of that nature, is this *curious* World oblig'd with. 'Tis true indeed his Lordship makes a Marginal

Note,

Note, to shew the possibility of the thing, or at most it's probability, for, under favour, the Observation he makes from Archbishop *Spotswood's* History of the Church of *Scotland*, does not come up to Proof. But that the King's Children were Episcopally Baptiz'd, appears highly probable, from several Considerations.

It is very well known, that King *James* 1st. never lik'd *Presbytery*, he observ'd it to be a very Arbitrary, Tyrannical sort of Government, which would raise itself above the Prerogative, and confront the Laws of the State, * the Preachers did frequently Preach Treason and Rebellion from their Pulpits, and pleaded an exemption from the Cognizance of the civil Magistrate, when they were question'd for their Violation of the Laws. † Mr. *David Blake* in his Sermon at *St. Andrews* declared, *that the King had discovered the Treachery of his Heart, that all Kings are the Devil's Bears,* [i. e. Children] *that the Queen of England, viz. [Q. Elizabeth] was an Atheist.* He call'd the Lords of the Session, *Miscreants* and *Bribers*, He said the Nobility were *Degenerated, Godless, Dissemblers, and Enemies to the Church;* and the Council were *Holliglasses, Commorants, and Men of no Religion;* In his Prayer for the Queen of *Scotland*, he us'd these Words, *We must pray for her for the Passion, but we have no Cause, She will never do us good.*

The Presbyterian Doctrines, particularly that of absolute Prædestination were so Rigid, Uncouth, and ill-grounded, that he never approved them; if his Majesty may be believed, he profess'd at the *Hampton-Court Conference*, (P. 20. of the Conference,)

* See the case of Mr. *Andrew Melvin*. P. 330. of Archbishop *Spotswood's* History of the Church of *Scotland*.

† See Archbishop *Spotswood's* History of the Church of *Scotland*. P. 424. Edit. 4th. Printed at London, in 1677.

rence,) that 'how far ever He Lived' among Puritans, 'and thus kept for the most Part, as a Ward under 'them; yet since He was of the Age of his Son, 10 'Years old, He ever disliked their Opinions, as the 'Favourite of the World, though he lived among 'them, he was not of them. Now is it imaginable that a Prince so extremely averse to the Presbyterian Sect, would be fond of having his Children sprinkled by the Supporters of it? Especially when He might with Ease enough, have procured a *Rightly Ordained, Episcopal Minister*; If He had no Bishops, or Inferior Ministers in his own Kingdom, He might have had either a Bishop, or other Inferior Minister from *England*, to have performed the Office of Baptism to his Children. But that there were Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in *Scotland*, when the King's Children were born, is a Point not only highly probable, but I had almost said an indisputable certainty. For Arch Bishop *Spotswood* in his forecited History, and the present Bishop of *Worcester*, Dr. *Dloja* have demonstratively proved, that Episcopacy was the first Ecclesiastical Government in *Scotland*, and shew plainly that the *Scots* had Bishops very early among them. * After some Time Dioceses were appointed for the Bishops by King *Malcolm*, 111. A. D. 1057. † If the curious Reader be pleased to consult Arch Bishop *Spotswood's* History, he will find at the End of it a compleat Catalogue of the BISHOPS, and ARCH-BISHOPS succeeding each other in their several SEES. It begins with those BISHOPS, who were in S. C. O. T. L. A. N. D before its Division into DIOCESES, the first of which is AMPHIBALUS, who was a Bishop there; An: Dòm: 277, and that there was a regular Succession of Bishops in every Age,

* See *Spotswood's* History, P. 3, 4, 7.

† See *Spotswood's* History, P. 29.

Age, or Century, that worthy Author, clearly makes appear. In the Reign of K. *James* the 6th of *Scotland*, and 1. of *England*, I am speaking of, there were Bishops as the said Historian shews, in several Dioceses, and observes further that at the Reformation Anno 1572 Episcopacy was continued, [see P. 260. 261.] This King himself was Baptiz'd by the Arch-Bishop of St. *Andrews*, [P. 197.] at whose Baptism were present the Bishops of *Dunkeld*, *Dumblane*, and *Ross*. After the barbarous Murder of his Father by the Earl of *Barrwell*, He was crowned, and anointed King in the Church of *Striveling* by the Bishop of *Orkney*, Anno 1567, and if any Man will be at the Pains to view the before mentioned Catalogue, he will see that there were Bps in *Scotland* not only before his Reign, but likewise when he was King there. Anno 1572 *John Douglas* was Bishop of St. *Andrews*, and Anno 1575, *Patrick Adamson* was Bishop of that SEE. Anno 1572 *Robert Creighton*, and *James Patton* were Bishops of *Dunkeld*. And Anno 1603, *Peter* ——— was of the same SEE.

Anno 1579, *David Cunningham* was Bishop of *Aberdeen*. And Anno 1603, *Peter Blackburn* was Bishop of the same SEE. Anno 1567, the Year of the King's Coronation, *Campbel* was Bishop of *Briehen*. Anno. 1572, *Andrew Grahame* was Bishop of *Dumblane*. Anno 1597, *David Lindsay* was Bishop of *Ross*. Anno 1599, *George Gladstones* was Bishop of *Caithnes*. Anno 1569 *Robert Stewart* was Bishop of *Orkney*. Anno 1572 *James Boyd* was Bishop of *Glasgow*. Anno 1581 *Robert Montgomery* was Bishop of that SEE. Anno 1587 *Will. Erskine* was Bishop of that SEE, Anno 1603, *John Spotswood* was Bishop of that SEE.

Thus I have observed from that excellent Historian Arch-Bishop *Spotswood*, that there were Bps. in *Scotland* in the Reign of K. *James* before spoken

of, when his Children were born, so that he might if he pleased, have them Baptized by a Bishop, or Episcopal Minister, and considering his great Aversion he had to Presbytery, it is most probable that he procur'd them to be Baptiz'd by a Bishop, or Episcopal Minister. Nay, we are expressly told by Arch-Bishop *Spotswood* [P. 407 of the said History,] that the Earl of *Suffex* Ambassador from the Queen of England, (*Q. Elizabeth*) presented Prince *Henry*, the King's Eldest Son to the Bishop who was appointed to administer the Sacrament. This was Mr. *David Cunningham* Bishop of *Aberdeen*, and that the rest of the King's Children were truly Baptized, by Mr. *David Lindsay*, Bishop of *Ross*, and Minister of *Leith*, will appear most probable from the forecited History of the Church of Scotland, P. 424. 455. 462. 520. of the London Edition in 1677. But if *K. Charles* 1. had not been Baptized at all, 'tis too evident to be denyed, that the Saints of 48 took care to Baptize him in his own Blood. Because he would not violate his Conscience, and Consent to the Abolition of *Episcopacy*, He fell a Sacrifice to the Enthusiastick Malice, and Fury, of *Fanatick implacable Demons*, He was most barbarously murdered by the Sons of *Belial* before his own Palace Gates in the Sight of the Sun. So that considering the Cause of Religion, for which that *Pious*, I had almost said, *Spotless* Prince suffered even unto Death, the Church has very just Reason to stile him in her Office for the 30th of January, *A Blessed Martyr*, notwithstanding Mr. *Shaw's Puritanic Flear* at that Title.

In a Word, had King *Charles* 1. not been Baptized at all, it had been indeed a Misfortune with regard to himself, but his Want of it would not have affected the present Cause, nor have prov'd the Validity of Lay-Baptism; for Truth, or the Nature

Nature of Things is not alter'd, either by Opinion, or Practice. But that King *James I.* his Children were *Rightly*, and *Episcopally* Baptized is I think, very indisputable, not only from this consideration of that King's Dislike to Presbytery, but also from hence, that there were Bishops then in *Scorland*, as I have observed from Arch-Bishop *Spotswood*, who might, and did administer the Sacrament of Baptism, [see the before mentioned Pages of that History, and the Catalogue of Bishops of *Scorland*,] P. 9. Mr. *Shaw* asks in the Bishop of *Oxford's* Words, 'How many Thousand does this Doctrine Unchristian of those, that were born in this Kingdom from the Year 1648 to the Year 1660? Whom yet our Church has receiv'd to Communion, and admitted to a Participation of her Sacraments? I answer, that by this Doctrine there are not so many Thousands Unchristian'd, within that Number of Years, as some are pleas'd to fancy, for it is doubtless a very great Mistake to imagine, that the Ministers who Baptized during those 12 Years of Rebellion, and Usurpation were only such as had received Presbyterian Ordination; No! If a just Computation were made, 'tis very certain, it would appear, that a very great, perhaps, the greater Number of those, who then officiated as Ministers, had been Ordain'd before by a Bishop; who tho' they submitted to those Times, yet afterwards, when the Government in Church, and State was restored, very readily conformed * as appears in the Appendix of this Book, Number 3, and many of those, who refus'd to conform, and were justly ejected the Livings they had usurp'd, had been Episcopally Ordain'd, as Mr. *Baxter*, *Hughes* of *Plimouth*, *Calvert*, *Calamy*, *Crompton*, *Sweetnam*, *Pool* my Adversaries Grandfather by his Mother's Side, with many others whom I speak of more

particularly in the Appendix Number 3.

So that their Baptisms were, I believe Valid, by virtue of their *Episcopal Ordination*, tho' they were, at the same time, *irregular* and *Schismatical*, because done out of the *Communion* of the Church. As for those Persons who were sprinkled in those sad times of *Anarchy*, and *Confusion*, by Pretenders to Holy Orders, since they were not conscious of the matter, nor consenting to the Usurpation upon the Ministerial Office, but verily believ'd, they had receiv'd true Christian Baptism, and liv'd according to the best knowledge, or light they had, it is to be hop'd, (as I have said before,) that God has sav'd such by his uncovenanted Mercy. If there be any Persons now living, (as probably there are,) who are assur'd, or have good reason to think, that they were wash'd by Lay-Baptizers; who never receiv'd a true Ordination, as they have now an Opportunity, of securing to themselves the great Privileges of the Gospel, by *true* Baptism, I think, they ought to procure it to be Administred to them, by an Episcopal Lawful Minister, and by so doing, they will remove all doubts, and fears, because then they may be sure they are in actual Covenant with Christ; If any Scruple to be Baptiz'd, because they cannot tell, but the pretended Administrators were Ministers, they may be Hypothetically, or Conditionally Baptiz'd as our Church allows in doubtful Cases, *if thou art not already Baptiz'd, I Baptize thee*, &c. So that should it prove that the Persons so Conditionally Baptiz'd, were Baptiz'd before, there will be no fault in such a *Conditional reiteration*. I declare it publicly, were I not sure I had been Baptiz'd, I would as soon as possible, for the Satisfaction of my own mind, and for the Security of my Title to Heaven, be Baptiz'd by an authoriz'd Minister, and would be wil-

ling to receive Baptism, before the greatest Congregation in the World, for no Man ought to be *asham'd* of being made a *Christian*. I am very glad to find so good, and Learned a Gentleman as Mr. *Bennet* of *Colchester*, who has done so great Service to Religion, and the Church of *England* in particular of the same Opinion, in regard of receiving Baptism. 'If it had been my misfortune, (says he,) to have been Baptiz'd by such a Person as was not authoriz'd by God, to perform that Office, I would be conditionally Re-baptiz'd; after the same manner which our Church prescribes in dubious Cases. For I do not think, 'twould otherwise be possible for me to enjoy Peace of Conscience for one single Moment. * As to what is urg'd as an argument, that our Church has receiv'd into Her Communion, &c. such as were never Episcopally Baptiz'd, it may be truly argu'd, that the Kingdom of Heaven, (by which † some understand the Church of Christ,) is resembled in the Gospel, to a Net, which takes *Fishes* good and bad, and to a Field which brings forth *Wheat and Tares*. St. *Mat.* 13 c. 25, and 27, v.

Men therefore of wicked Principles and Practice, will sometimes assemble with the Orthodox, and pious, (upon what Motives I do not now enquire) and 'tis to be hop'd, that by a frequent attendance at the Place of God's Worship, such may by God's Grace, be, one time, or other, convinc'd, and converted.

But if such as never were Baptiz'd, have been admitted to a Participation of the Sacrament (of the Lord's Supper) such admission, (I humbly hope,) was allow'd upon a Charitable Presumption, that they had been before Baptiz'd, according to the

* Mr. *Bennet's* Rights of the Clergy 1 Vol. p. 325.

† See *Pool's Synopsis Criticorum* upon the 13 c. St. *Mat.* 23 v.

the prescrib'd Rules of the Church, for otherwise 'twere very absurd, and incompatible with the Constitution of the Church, to admit a Person *knowingly*, and *wilfully*, to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, before he has receiv'd the Sacrament of Baptism, and should a Clergyman admit of such, he knows, are not Baptiz'd, I cannot see, how he can answer it to God, or Man, nor expect the Satisfaction of his own Conscience. But is it not highly probable, that the Bishops who Confirm'd, and the Priests who Administred the Lord's Supper to, adult Persons, since the Happy Restauration, did, and do, suppose, that they were, and are of the Communion of the Church of *Eng.* and were Baptiz'd by one of Her Ministers, or if they were, or are Converts from *Heresy* or *Schism*, that they did, or do, qualify themselves as our Church requires, *i. e.* by a previous, *true* Baptism? And since there is an Office of Baptism, provided by our Church, for those of Riper Years; Why may not the Clergy Charitably hope, it has been made use of accordingly? Can we imagine, that the Office was designed only for the Converts from *Judaism*, *Mahometism*, and *Paganism*? What is there in that Office, or the Rubricks of it, that confines it to these *only*? Nay, is it not highly probable that it was Compos'd chiefly for, and with a more particular View to, *those* who in the late time of Disorder, and Rebellion against Church and State, had either receiv'd no Baptism at all, or no other than the *Lay-Baptism* of such as were never truly Ordain'd? But what makes this more than a probable Conjecture, is this Consideration, that in the last review of the Liturgy, the very next Year after the Restauration, *viz.* Anno 1661, * This Office

* See Dr. Nisboll's Commentary on the Book of Common-Prayer, Preface P. 10. Fol. Edit. Printed at London. 1712.

fice was Compos'd, and with the other Additional
 Offices Unanimously subscrib'd to, by both Houses
 of Convocation, Dec. the 20th, in the Year 1661.
 That the Office was design'd for the admission of
 those, into the Christian Church, as were never
rightly Baptiz'd, I observe with Satisfaction, is the
 Opinion of that very judicious Learned Divine,
 Dr. *Hicks* in his Preface to that, (I think) unan-
 swerable Book, viz. *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, (P. 21.
 of the Preface.) our Author observes, P. 10. from
 His Lordship's charge, that *'it is not to be doubt-*
'ed but many of those, who had no other, but meer
'Lay-Baptism, from 1548, to 1603, or were Bap-
'tiz'd by Persons not Episcopally Ordain'd from
'1648 to 1660, have been admitted to Holy Orders
'in our Church. Whether it be so *undoubted* a
 point or not, that such as have been sprinkled by
 Lay Hands, within those Periods have been admit-
 ted into Holy Orders, I do not stay to enquire,
 if it be so *undoubted*, 'tis very strange his Lord-
 ship did not mention the Names of a few particu-
 lar Persons, among so many. The *Dissenting*
 Teacher, indeed supposing perhaps his Lordship's
 Charge defective in that respect, has added with-
 in a Parenthesis, (*'that it hath been commonly*
'reported, that Archbishop Tillotson, and the pre-
'sent Bishops of Ely, Exon, Sarum, and Gloucester,
'had no other than Presbyterian Baptism.) Whe-
 ther Archbishop *Tillotson*, and the other Bishops he
 mentions, had no other than *Presbyterian Baptism*,
 Mr. *Shaw* does not pretend to prove a certainty;
 all the grounds he has for that Suggestion, is on-
 ly a common report, but *Fame* (we say) is very
 often a *Liar*, and if we must believe every thing
 that is reported, what unworthy thoughts must
 we have of Persons, and acts which merit the
 highest applause, and commendation! Into what
 fatal mistakes may we be misled! If the determi-
 nation

nation of this Controversy, depended upon the *Baptism* of these Prelates, whatever *it* were, then indeed I confess, it had been worth the while, to have made the most exact enquiry, by whom they had been Baptiz'd.

But since neither private Opinion, nor Corrupt Practice in times of Distraction and Confusion, can make that *right*, which *in se*, or its own nature is *wrong*, I, therefore, do not think my self under any Obligation to be at the pains of a diligent Search of *Registers*. If their Lordship's were not very well assur'd, that they were *rightly* and *lawfully* Baptiz'd, I am willing to hope they immediately would be so; if Mr. *Shaw* will allow me to use the same argument that he does, (which is but fair, and equal,) I would tell him that it has been reported that Archbishop *Tillotson* was *Episcopally* Baptiz'd, and a Gentleman of *Torkshire*, who liv'd in the Neighbourhood, where Archbishop *Tillotson* was born, did affirm before several Gentlemen in my hearing, that at the request of a wealthy Relation, it was allow'd, that he should be Baptiz'd by an Episcopal Minister, I don't vouch for the truth of this assertion, but since Mr. *Shaw* Grounds an argument upon no better Authority than *report*, why is not *this* as good an argument *for*, as *against*, his Baptism! That the Bishop of *Exon* was *Episcopally* baptized, (if not all the rest,) is, I think, very probable. Mr. *Withers* a *Dissenting Teacher* tells us in his caveat, 8c. p. 27. 'His Lordship was born in the Parish of St. Gregory's near St. Paul's London, in April 1655. from whence he would fain infer, that His Lordship *had no other then Presbyterian Baptism*; on the contrary I thence infer, that he was *truly, &c. Episcopally* baptiz'd, for it is to be consider'd, that the Church of St. Gregory was supply'd even in *those* times of *Usurpation* by *Episcopal* Divines; The Liturgy was continually us'd, the

the Sacraments celebrated according to the rites of the Church of England: Dr. Gillingham, or Dr. Hewitt was Minister when his Lordship was born there; both which had been ordained by a Bishop, so that whoever of them baptized his Lordship, his Baptism is Valid.*

After this *Daring Attempt* of our Authors to prove our Bishops no Christians by his *powerful Argument* built upon *Hearsay*, and *Report*, he proceeds to say, that 'there's great Reason to believe that some of those very Clergymen are fallen into this Notion, by which themselves are no Christians, and yet, (says he,) I never heard of any of them, who were Rebaptiz'd, as methinks they should, if they thought themselves no Christians, or would persuade others to this Practice; for this Charity sure should begin at Home. Whatever Reason Mr. Shaw may fancy he has to believe as he does, I shall shew that he has no good Reasons at all; and the Observation seems to be made, to cast a Reflexion upon the Clergy, particularly upon us of this Country, whom to please he hinted at, by what has been discoursed since he published his great Performance. But here I ask, Did any of the Clergy tell this Gentleman that they had never been Baptiz'd? Did they ever whisper such a Secret as this in his Ear? If he were required to give Instances there is great Reason to believe he could not produce one. I know indeed the Names of some are mentioned, but I can assure the World, the Assertion is not true. Mr. Sturges's Minister of All-Saints, Darby, was, as himself tells me, Baptized by his own Father, who was his immediate

N

ate

* There is just now come to my Hands A Reply to Mr. Whitbys's Caveat by Mr. Benjamin Reed, that Gentleman who is lately converted to the Church of England speaks very particularly to this Point of his Lordship's Baptism. P. 49. 50. 51.

the Predecessor in the Rectory of Sudbury in this
 County, he now enjoys. Mr. Blackmall Vicar of
 Bishops, and Head School-Master in Derby, (to
 whom I owe the most grateful Acknowledgments
 for his useful Education of me) he I say, was
 Baptized by Mr. Moore late Rector of Kirkstretton
 in this County, who was ordained by Dr. Gun-
 ling late Bishop of Ely. As for my own Particu-
 lar I was Baptized by Mr. Goodhead late Vi-
 car of Ashbourne in this County Oct. 1684,
 the last Year of King Charles 2. Reign, and that
 he was Ordained by a Bishop, I am very certain,
 because I have seen both his *Orations* and *Priest's*
Orders. Had these Clergymen not been Episco-
 pally Ordained, by whom we were Baptized how
 is it imaginable that they could have possessed
 their Cures so long as they did? How could
 they have stood the Test of the present Bishop
 of Worcester, who when Bishop of this Diocess of
 Litchfield and Coventry, (to his Lordship's Honour
 be it spoken,) perused at his Primary Visitation
 here, as I am credibly informed, the Orders of eve-
 ry Person that had a Cure. Well! But now our
 Author returns to the Bishop of Oxford's
 Charge, (which he is so much Obligated to for his
 Quotations,) and tells us his Lordship affirms that
' he that is not a Christian can never be a Priest or
' Lawful Minister of a Christian Church. And he that
' is not Baptized cannot be made a Christian, by
' Ordination. To this assertion, (for 'tis indeed
 no more,) I return this answer. That supposing
 there have been, or are some in Holy Orders, who
 never were Baptized, it does not follow from
 thence that they were not, or are not, true Bishops,
 and Priests, or that the Sacraments Administred
 by them are Invalid, or their Ordinations void, as
 Mr. Shaw very pertly, and briefly Concludes they
 are, for it ought to be considered, that the Acts of
 the

the Ministry which the Clergy perform, are not done by virtue of their *Baptism*, but by virtue of their *Commission* they have received, for if Baptism gives a right to execute the Ministerial Offices, so that without it, they cannot be executed at all, then it will follow, that he that is Baptized himself, may Baptize others; and I grant, no Man ought to offer himself for Ordination, that is conscious of his Want of Baptism, because he ought regularly and for his own personal Benefit to be a Member of Christ's Church, before he receives his Commission to act in, and admit others into it. He ought to procure all imaginable personal Qualifications, before he receives the *Authoritative Obedience*, but yet, should he want these, personal Qualifications, as for Instance, *Baptism*, or should he lead a wicked Life, and ungodly Conversation, he is still a Minister of God, as he is vested with his *Authority*, by Ordination; so that whether he be Baptized, or no himself, whether he be a good Man, or an Hypocrite is nothing at all to Me, nor am I concerned to make Enquiry about it, his Commission is not affected, or hurt by his personal defects; 'tis true his Want of Baptism is an *Unhappiness* to himself, and the Want of, if it is his own Fault may be of a very *Fatal* Consequence and so may his *Disorderly Conversation*, too. But it is enough for Me to be satisfied that the Person who officiates as a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of Christ, has received a true *Commission*, or *Ordination*, which if he has received, the Orders he confers, and the Sacraments he administers are all *Valid*, because they are done by Virtue of Christ's *Commission*, they are done in *Christ's Name*, and not in the *Administrator's Name*, and therefore Christ will ratify them.

St. Paul plainly intimates that a Minister may be an instrument of saving the Souls of others,

by his Ministrations, tho' he may be *a cast away* himself, for as the 26th Article of our Church observes, '*tho' sometimes the evil have Chief Authority in the Ministration of the Word, and Sacraments; yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own Name but in Christ's, and do Minister by his Commission, and Authority, we may use their Ministry, both in Hearing the Word of God, and in Receiving of the Sacraments, which be effectual, because of Christ's Institution, and Promise.* So that hence it appears, that it is the Judgment of the Church of England, that all that is incumbent upon her Members, is, to know whether the Person that Officiates as Christ's Minister, has a *Lawful* call, and is *truly sent*, i. e. is Ordain'd by a Bishop, if he be, his Ministrations are Valid, because of *Christ's Institution and Promise*, whatever the Administrator's defects and failures may be, for the unworthiness of the Minister, *binders not the efficacy of the Sacrament*, in those that are worthy. But to put this matter out of all doubt, and beyond all exception. It is very observable, that St. Paul was Commission'd to be a Minister, by an immediate call from Heaven, before ever he had receiv'd *Christian Baptism*, Acts, 9. Ch. Now the Question is here, whether St. Paul's Ordination or Commission was *Valid*, or *not*, before he receiv'd Baptism from Ananias, vs 18. Either it was *Valid*, or it was *not*, it could not be partly *Valid*, and partly *Invalid*, there is no *magis*, and *minus* in this Case, no more than in Baptism before spoken of. If his Ordination was *Invalid*, for want of a preceding Baptism, let Mr. Shaw prove it, let him produce one Text of Scripture, or one Testimony of any Ancient Father, to support the Notion. If he cannot do either, his Assertion is of no weight, or moment; but that St. Paul's Ordination, (and so consequently all other of the like Nature

Nature,) was *Valid*, tho' before Baptism, will appear from this Observation, that he never receiv'd any other Ordination *after* Baptism, as surely he should have done, if his Ordination had not been *Valid*, for want of a prævious Baptism; all his Acts, and Ministrations, were perform'd by virtue of that Ordination he had receiv'd before Baptism. And his Baptism which follow'd his Ordination, could not possibly give him a Commission, for if Baptism could make a *Minister*, then every person that is Baptiz'd would be a Minister; but that *St. Paul* himself, did look upon himself to be a *Minister*, by virtue of that Call from Heaven, which was before his Baptism, that he thought his Authority was *altogether* owing to his Ordination; and not to his Baptism, is plain from what himself says, in his Epistle to the *Gal.* 1. c. 1. v. *Paul an Apostle, not of Men, neither by Man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.* and again, 1. Tim. 1. c. 1. v. *Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the Commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ.* once more, *Gal.* 1. c. 11, 12. v. *But I certify you, Brethren, that the Gospel which was Preached of me, is not after Man, for I neither receiv'd it of Man, neither was I taught it, but by the Revelation of Jesus Christ.* Now had his Ordination by a voice from Heaven, as he Travell'd to *Damascus*, not been *Valid*, for want of Baptism, had his Baptism confirm'd his Orders, and constituted him a Minister, then he must have said he had been made such by *Man*, viz. by one *Ananias* who Baptiz'd him; but since he affirms otherwise, 'tis plain he believ'd his Ordination to be *Valid*, tho' he had receiv'd it before Baptism, and therefore the Consequences which *Mr. Shaw*, and others would infer, are not just, and true. As to the Assertion our Transcriber cites from the Bishop of *Oxford's* Charge, viz. 'that

" a Person who has been seriously Baptiz'd in, or with
 " Water, in the Name of the Father, &c. tho' the Bap-
 " tizer was not an Episcopally Ordain'd Minister, ought
 " not to be Baptiz'd again, and that our Church does
 " not declare such Baptisms to be Invalid, and Null,
 " nor requires 'em to be repeated. I have spoken
 to that matter already, and have, I hope, fully
 prov'd, that the Administrator is of the essence of
 Baptism, and that our Church allows no Baptism,
 but that which is Administred by a Lawful Mi-
 nister, i. e. one Episcopally Ordain'd, and there-
 fore the Clergy who Baptize Children, or adult
 Persons, who have not been rightly Baptiz'd, act
 very consistently with, and conformably to, the
 Laws of God, and the Church, and such acts of
 theirs are not, cannot, with any propriety of Speech,
 be call'd; Re-baptizations, because they are only
 Baptisms. And tho' (according to Mr. Shaw's
 Discovery;) " Some of the most pious, and Learned
 " Fathers of the Church are of another Opinion, yet
 " their Clergy may still be Dutiful Sons, tho' they
 " differ from their Fathers in that Point; for no
 Man is Obliged by his Oath of Canonical Obedience
 to subscribe to the Private Opinions, and Senti-
 ments of his Diocesan, and to believe in all Things
 just as he does, but to Obey him in those Things
 only he requires, which are according to the Ca-
 nons and Ecclesiastical Laws of this Realm, So
 that tho' it be the Practice of a great many Cler-
 gymen to Baptize such as are converted from He-
 resy, and Schism, to the Church, they are humbly
 of Opinion, and have good Reason to support it,
 that they act agreeably with their solemn Oaths,
 Promises, and Subscription, they made at the Times
 of their Ordinations. What Wonder is it then that
 they should Embrace every Opportunity to per-
 form their Office! Why might not that Clergy-
 man Mr. Shaw hint at Baptizing a Child of about 3 or
 4 Years

4 Years Old, when the Father came himself to him, acknowledged his Conviction of the Invalidity of Bay-Baptism from a Sermon he heard Preached by that Clergyman on that Subject, when he gave good Reasons to conclude that his Child was not truly Baptized, and therefore desired it might receive Episcopal Baptism. And as to the Malefactor of 60 Years Old, or upwards; [viz. *William Fall* a Scotchman, and a Presbyterian,] who was Baptized just before his Execution; the Clergyman who performed that Charitable Office makes no scruple to own it; and Those who gave Advice in that Case, and by Arguments convinced the Criminal of the Necessity of Baptism where it might be had, are not ashamed of what they said, or did. They think they performed a very Charitable, Christian Act; and tho' as Mr. *Shaw* Fearingly expresses it, 'He had lived in Heathen, and died at the Gallows,' they thought it very great Charity, whatever he may think, to make him a Christian before his Exit. Nay, The Criminal desired them (to Use his own Expression,) to make his Condition as safe as they could, and tho' he lived in Heathen, tis to be hoped, that by his Repentance, and Baptism, his Sins were washed away. But least the Man might be Mistaken, and might (possibly) be Baptized by an Episcopal Minister, (tho' he said he had not) I will here tell Mr. *Shaw* what he did not know before, and that is, that he was Baptized Hypothetically, or Conditionally. If thou art not already Baptized, I Baptize thee in the Name, &c. And now, after all, Why does Mr. *Shaw* make a Jest of this Matter, because 'He had lived in Heathen all his Life, & was great Charity to make him a Christian at his Death, tho' he dyed at the Gallows. And was it not great Charity to take all possible Care of his Soul's Salvation? What was not his Soul capable of Sal.

Salvation, because he died at the Gallows? According to our Author's Suggestion, *Hugh Peters* the Presbyterian-Teacher, *Harrison*, *Cook*, *Scot*, *Carm*, and *Axtell*, and the Rest of the Regicides, could not be saved, because it seems they dyed at a Gallows; and yet surely, 'tis impossible that such *precious Saints* as *these* should be damned! Well then if these might be saved, tho' they dyed at the Gallows, because they were of the *Godly Party*, why might not this condemned Person be saved, who, I believe, sincerely repented of his wicked Life, which those *Regicides* never did.

But to be short, one would be almost tempted to suppose, from this Expression of Mr. *Shaw*, that he looks upon the *Poor* and *Unfortunate* to be so inconsiderable as not to deserve his Notice. They may feel a Famine of the Word, for him, and get to Heaven how they can. He, *GOOD MAN*, like the *Romish* Missionaries desires to live in the richest Soils, and to deal only with the Great, and Prosperous, they doubtless are of the Number of the Elect, and can pay well for Attendance, but as for Beggars, and such as die at the Gallows, no present Reward is to be expected from *Them*, and if they have lived *Heathens*, they may die so, his Charity, how much soever boasted of, must not be so extensive, where no worldly good can be got by it. Thus I say, it will be natural for a Man to infer, that reads our Author's *Witricism*.

In the next Paragraph, P. 12. He compares this Fact of the Malefactors Baptism to the *Popish* Inquisition. But where the Justness of the Comparison lies, will, I fancy, Puzzle this Gentleman's Ingenuity to shew. What Resemblance is there between this, and that? Did the Clergymen who urged Arguments to the Criminal to convince his Reason, force him to be baptized? All that were Privy to that Transaction, knew, it was done by his

his Approbation ? Did Mr. Harris Con-
demn him to be hanged ? Did he Deliver
him over to the secular Arm to be put to
Death ? Had not the Judge of Assize passed Sen-
tence before his Baptism ? What Hand then had
the Clergy in his Execution ? Certainly none at
all. How unparallel'd is it with the present Case ?
Indeed how *Weak, Trifling, and Silly* is it ? Who
would have expected so *Ridiculous* a Comparison
from one of Mr. Shaw's *Shining Characters* ? To
what End then is it made, but with this Design to
cast a Reflection upon those Clergymen, who were
concerned in the Business of Administering the be-
fore-mentioned Baptism ; and if the Reflexion turns
upon himself, he may thank himself for it. I leave
him to Mr. Harris his Castigation.

But our Author goes on with the Trade of
Quotations, and tells us that another *Writer upon*
this Head who defends the Doctrine and Practice
of the Church against modern Innovations observes
what *vast Confusion*, this *Doctrine* I maintain, *would*
bring along with it, and how many Thousands must
be brought back to the Font again, which by the
Way is an Unaccuracy, and borders upon Non-
sense, for how can People be *brought back again*
to a Place they were never at before. But to let
that pass. Under Favour, the *Confusion* is not so
great as this *Accurate Writer* imagines. For if we
take one Parish with another, and suppose an hun-
dred in each Parish *Unbaptized*. Might not *They*
be with great Ease *Baptized* by the Minister *alone*
in a few Hours ? Upon his repeating the Form of
Baptism but once, and instead of *Thee*, saying *Ye*,
he might Baptize what Number he pleas'd ; nay,
if he repeats the Form to every individual Person,
he may Baptize an hundred in much less Time,
than he administers the Lord's Supper to the same
Number ; for the Form of Administration of Bap-
tism

tism is much shorter than *That* of the Lord's Supper. But if the Fatigue were too great, the Assistance of other Clergymen will make the task very easy and supportable. If a Bishop can confirm a great Number in an Hour or two's Time, may not a greater Number be Baptized within the same Time, since the Form of Baptism is shorter than *That* of Confirmation? If the Apostles did, in all Probability, *justify*, Baptize three Thousand in *One Day*, may not the same number of Clergymen do the same Thing? Where then will be the Confusion in this Case? And why may not an hundred Persons receive the Sacrament of Baptism, without Confusion, as well as an hundred Persons receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? Perhaps the Form of Baptism was purposely made short to prevent this *imaginary* Confusion.

Wherefore supposing that there is a Parish, (as Mr. Shaw affirms P. 13. but does not Name,) where the Person who performed all Ministerial Acts for thirty Years together had no Orders at all, the Disorders will not be so strange, as Mr. Shaw imagines, when what has been said just now is considered; it may be presumed that the Number of the Unbaptized is not greater than has been formerly in some Countries, and if the Number were three Thousand, the Baptism of them might be performed, with Facility enough, as I have shewn in a few Lines before. What he quotes from the before mentioned Writer, as to unbaptiz'd Persons being admitted to the Lord's Supper, and into Orders, is the same in Substance with his Quotations from the Bishop of Oxford's Charge, which has been particularly answer'd, and therefore I shall not be guilty of the Fault my Adversary frequently runs into of making Repetitions.

But now Mr. Shaw comes happily to a Conclusion, and tells the World in another borrowed Quotation

tation from his Friend the Author of the before-mentioned Pamphlet, viz. *A Disswaver from Jacobitism*, that there are two Reasons why this Notion as (he calls it) of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism is *now so industriously spread*, and the first Reason is 'in Order to divide Protestants among themselves, the second is, in a Word, to render the House of Hanover odious, and to serve the Pretender.

As to the first Reason, I answer. That if Mr. Shaw, and the rest of his Brethren would renounce their *Schism*, and submit to Episcopacy, and come to Church as they ought to do, we might hope to see an End of our Divisions. But what a solemn Piece of *Hypocrisy* is it, to hear Men declaiming against Divisions, when they are the very Persons that live by them.

As to the second Reason, I affirm 'tis both *Palsa* and *Villainous*, 'tis a Suggestion which endeavours to render the far greater Part of the Clergy, obnoxious to the present Government, and to make them odious to the People, and therefore it very well deserves the Chastizement of the *severest* Language.

What is this but using the Clergy, as the Heathens did the Primitive Christians? 'Tis sewing them up in *Bears-Skins* to be pulled in Pieces. What! Cannot a Clergyman assert, and prove the Invalidity of Presbyterian Lay-Baptism, but he must be brought into a Plot immediately to set aside the Succession in the illustrious House of Hanover, and to bring in the Pretender. Where is the Charity this Gentleman has so much talked of to represent so many thousand Clergymen as Enemies to the Government, and Succession, when they have so often sworn Allegiance, to her sacred Majesty, and abjured the Pretender? Almost any Fidelity put upon the Clergy, might sooner be pardoned than this. This

is to call us in plainer Words, the worst, and most perjured Villains. But perhaps the Dissenters measure our Loyalty by their own; when they swore Fidelity, & made Addresses to the *Queen's* unfortunate Royal Father, they invoked God to be Witness of the Sincerity of their Hearts, and yet, as I have both been told, and read, being then too Young to know it, they proved *False* and *Treacherous*. Do they think therefore that our Consciences are like their own? As tender as some Consciences seem to be, some very *hard* Things have not oppressed *them*.

But to return, By this very Quotation, Mr. *Shaw* and his Author do the very Thing they would charge upon the Clergy; They endeavour to cast an *Odium*, and *Reproach* upon that illustrious Family, by suggesting that they have no other than Presbyterian Lay-Baptism; but pray how do the Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism commend, and extol the *Gallican-Church* in which the *Pretender* is educated? Is it not notorious that those of the *Romish* Communion allow Laymen's and Midwives Washings to be Valid? Is not then the Validity of Lay-Baptism a *Popish* Notion? How then do those who assert, and prove it Null, and Void, extol the *Gallican-Church*? What! is condemning, and commending the same Thing? When all sorts of Lay-Baptisms by whomsoever performed are condemned as Nullities; are not those in the *Romish* Communions by Lay-Persons condemned also? Where is there any Exception made? If there be any let Mr. *Shaw* shew it. In short, this Instance of the *Pretender*, and the *Gallican-Church* is Nothing at all to the Purpose.

Thus I have followed Mr. *Shaw* thro' every Page of his first Part of his Pamphlet which refers

to Lay-Baptism. I have shewn that 'tis the Opinion of many of our Bishops, and * Divines, *Dead*, and *Living*, to whom I add Dr. *Comber*, that Lay-Baptism is Invalid; I have observed further that 'tis Invalid in the Judgment of Mr. *Calvin*, and the *Reform'd*, the present *Kirk of Scotland*, and the *Old Puritans*, particularly Mr. *Thomas Edwards*, to whom I may add Mr. *Thomas Cartwright*. I have also proved that the Dissenting Teachers *now* condemn Lay-Baptism, as appears plainly from their Subscription to the 23d. Article of our Church. So that they are forc'd to pretend that they have had a true Ordination; and since they do pretend to it, I have, I think, clearly made appear from Scripture and Antiquity, that they are no Ministers at all, but Usurpers upon the Priesthood, and have moreover demonstrated that the Church of *England* looks upon them as *such*, and esteems their *Lay Baptism* to be *Invalid*, for want of a true Commission. So that the private Opinion of *This*, or *That Great Man*, is not conclusive in the present Controversy, and cannot alter the nature of Truth.

And because our *Dissenters* pretend that the Case of *Themselves*, and the *Reform'd* is the same, I have shew'd that 'tis vastly different, that the seperation of our *Dissenters* here, is by *Them* condemn'd as a Schism; and in a Word, I have offer'd further, that *those* of the *Reform'd* who reject *Episcopacy*, and *true Baptism*, *unchurch* and *unchristian* themselves.

So that upon the whole, the Assertors of the Doctrine of the *Invalidity* of *Lay Baptism*, whether *Old*, or *Young*, (for they are of all Ages, tho' Mr.

* To these I add, Dr. *Comber* who gives his Opinion, that he that does Baptize, ought to be a Lawful Minister; I refer the Reader to his own Words in his Discourse upon the Office of Baptism, Sect 2. Sect 4. the form of Baptism. P. 429 Edition 8vo.

Mr. *Shaw* sets down Young Ministers only) *they*, I say, can justify their Principles, as agreeable to Scripture, the Judgment, and Practice of the Primitive Church, and the Church of England, not to mention the Judgment of the Reformed, &c. before spoken of, and consequently their *Presumption*, is not so great as our Author represents it; and if any of our Fathers maintain an Opinion, which, to say the least of it, the Church does not approve, their Sons are not *undutiful*, if they refuse to Subscribe to it.

I am now come to answer the second part of this great Work, P. 14. in which Mr. *Shaw* promises to prove, as the Title plainly imports, *the unreasonableness of refusing Burial to Children Baptiz'd by Dissenting Ministers*. Now this he undertakes to do, by shewing, 1. *The inconsistency of this Practice*. 2. *The insignificance of the threatening*. 3dly, *Offering His Advice thereupon*. This is, it seems, a new method of proving the *unreasonableness* of a thing.

He says then 1. That this refusal is inconsistent with the 68th. Canon of our Church. But now 'tis here very observable, that Mr. *Shaw* is guilty of a very unfair Practice, for he only recites the latter part of that Canon, and conceals the former which will set this matter in a true light, now in the former part it is said, *'no Minister shall refuse, or delay to Christen any Child, according to the form of the Book of Common Prayer, that is brought to the Church to Him upon Sundays, or Holidays, to be Christen'd, nor shall he refuse to Bury any Corps, (i. e. of any Baptiz'd as aforesaid,) except the Party Deceased, were denounc'd Excommunicated*. MAJORI EXCOMMUNICAT-
TIONS.

So that 'tis plain from hence, that the Church requires, that all Persons shall be Baptiz'd by Her

Her Lawful Ministers, according to *her* form in the Liturgy, and at the proper place; which Persons being so Baptiz'd, shall be Bury'd when Dead, in such manner, and form, as is prescribed in the Book of Common-Prayer, except they died under the greater Sentence of Excommunication; wherefore our Church does not suppose that any Persons are Baptiz'd by any other, than *Her own Officers, and Administrators*, and consequently if they are not here Baptiz'd by *Them*, they have no Title to *Her* Burial.

That the Canon is to be understood in this Sense, is I think, very evident from this single Consideration, viz. That the Book of Canons was made in the first Year of the Reign of K. James I. Anno 1603. at which time no *Lay-Baptizers* were allow'd; all were requir'd to be Baptiz'd by the Clergy of the Establish'd Church, and enquiry was made by the Bishops at their Visitations, concerning the Administration of Baptism by Women, and Lay-Persons, which was not allow'd of in the Practice of the Church, on the contrary was censur'd, as I have before observed from the *Hampton-Court Conference*. How then does this Authority from the Canon serve Mr. Shaw's Purpose? Wherein consists this plain Disobedience to the Canon as our Author styles the Refusal of reading the Burial Office over the *Unbaptiz'd*? How does it clash, and interfere with Canonical Obedience? Nay, is it not evident that this very Canon Mr. Shaw quotes, supposes that the Persons that are brought to be buried, have had *Episcopal Baptism*?

But Mr. Shaw foreseeing that it would be urg'd, by Way of further Explanation of this Canon, that the *Rubrick* before the Burial Office expressly prohibits the Use of it over *Unbaptized Persons*, therefore he very Modestly, and after his positive Way affirms, that the Church of England allows the

the Dissenting Teachers Lay-Baptisms to be Valid, which is so far from being a *true Assertion*, that I have, I think, *irrefragably* prov'd it false; for I have shewn from the Articles, Rubricks, Preface before the Office of Ordination, and from the Practice of Ordaining the *French Ministers*, &c. that our Church allows of no Baptism but that which is performed by a *Lawful Episcopal Minister*, and therefore all that die without such *Episcopal Baptism*, are not in *Her Sense* Baptized at all, and by Consequence have no Right, or Title to *Her Burial*. For so the Church affirms expressly in the Rubrick before the *Burial Office*. *Here is to be noted, that the Office ensuing is not to be used for any that die Unbaptized, or Excommunicate, or have laid violent Hands upon themselves.* Where by that Expression, *Here is to be noted*, our Church plainly requires the Clergy to take Notice in order to distinguish between those who have been Baptized, and those who have not (so far as their Knowledge and Observation can reach,) that they may not be guilty of so *absurd* a Practice, as the Reading the *Burial Office* over such who were never made Members of Christ's Church, evidently implies. For with what Propriety of Speech can a Clergyman as * one expresses it (*viz.* Mr. P. Barclay) call any Man, Woman, or Child, our Dear Brother, or Sister in Christ that never was made a Christian (as no Unbaptized Person ever was or can be) and if we cannot call them, we cannot perform any Christian Office to them, or about them, as such, we cannot say that they are within the Covenant of Grace, because their Patent was not *paid*. But we are far from Saying, and Determining that Infants are damned, who die without *Bap-*

* See his Discourse on the Common-Prayer, being a Persuasive to the People of Scotland, in the Office of Burial. P.

Baptism; we say, they can't be saved by God's ordinary Way, but his Uncovenanted Mercy is boundless and so that we leave them.

But Mr. Shaw goes on 2dly, p. 16. to prove the Unreasonableness of the Thing, because 'tis inconsistent with the Practice of the Dignified Clergy in London, and most Places of the Kingdom.

To which I answer. That if there be a corrupt Practice of any Kind, contrary to a *Fix'd Establish'd* Law, that Practice is no Rule for Men to act by; for we are not to consider what *is* done, but what *ought* to be done. Nor are the Examples of the *Greatest and most Dignified* to be imitated if they should happen to do any Thing that is forbid by the Constitutions of our Church. Nay, I do affirm, that the Example of a Clergyman of the *Meanest* Preferments is to be followed, if his Conduct and Practice be agreeable to the Rubricks, and Canons; and if what these Clergymen do in *this particular*, be according to the Rubricks and Canons, which are ratified by the State, and made a Part of the Statute Law of this Kingdom; What Reason is there, that, *they* should be thus *clamour'd upon*, and *blamed*, when they have the *Laws* on their Side, for the Canon as I have explained it, justifies the Practice, and if that Canon was not clear, and expressive enough in this Case, the Rubrick in the Burial-Office which was made in 1661 is a very good Interpretation, and does very plainly prohibit the Use of the Burial Office over any *Unbaptized Person*. But now supposing the general Practice were contrary to the Law in this or other Instance, All that can be urged in Vindication and Excuse, can be only this, that this, or that Canon; or Rubrick is grown into Disuse, and how far that will justify. See Dr. *Wettenhall's* Gifts and Offices, P. 179.

But then if any Clergyman, or Number of Clergy-

Clergymen have good Reason, or are verily persuaded that they ought to restore Discipline as much as they can, and revive the Observance of the Ecclesiastical Laws, if they are of Opinion, that whilst the Reason, for the making, this, or that Law, continues, the Obligation to observe it, does not, cannot cease; Why must they be charged with *Innovations*, when as I have said, they have the Laws to justify them. But yet after all, the Practice of reading the Burial Office over the Unbaptiz'd, is not so general as Mr. *Shew* imagines. For besides the Clergy of this Country who have made an Agreement not to read the Office over the Unbaptiz'd, there are others who might be mentioned, were it necessary. Even in the late Reign when the *Dissenters* flattered themselves with the greatest hopes of being soon our Masters, Mr. *Lord* late Minister of *Abby de la Zouch* a Market Town in *Leicestershire*, and Mr. *Walters* late Vicar of *Leak* a Market Town in *Staffordshire*, would not read the Office over any, who had not been Baptized by an *Episcopal Lawful Minister*.

Whether at London the Clergy bury all, without distinction, as is affirmed, I do not pretend to know, but this may be said in Relation to Them, that in so Large, and Populous a City as London is, the Ministers of the Parishes there, cannot be supposed to know all their People; nor be certainly assured whether the Persons brought to be inter'd were *Episcopally Baptized*, or no, and since they do not know that they were not Baptized, they Charitably hope, that they were, nay, further, they hope too, that the Deceased Persons died in the Communion of the Church of England; for had they Died in *Schism*, it may be presumed'd they would be carried to *Bunhill-Fields*, to be inter'd there in the *Presbyterian Burial Place*. So that the Difference

rence

rence between the City, and Country is very Great, for here we can soon be informed what Dissenters Children are born in our Parishes, and accordingly can, and do offer Baptism, which is with Scorn rejected: But there the Clergy, by Reason of the great Numbers of Inhabitants cannot.

As to what is affirm'd of Mr. Dryden's, and Mr. St. Everemont's Burial, 'tis sufficient to say, that the Clergymen who read the Office of Burial over them, did doubtless believe that they had been truly Baptiz'd, and since the Clergymen could not prove the contrary, they were under no Obligation that I know of, to dispatch Messengers to France, or other places, to make enquiry concerning their Baptism. Since the deceased had not been denounced Excommunicated **MAJORI EXCOMMUNICATIONE**, They had a Title according to the 68th Canon, to Burial. Indeed had they been only sprinkled by Lay-men, and Women, then I confess *the Baptism of Dissenters must be as good as theirs, i. e. the Baptism would have been the same; viz. Lay-Baptism, and consequently all alike invalid.* But if any of the Lay-Baptizers may plead a preference, I think, those in Popish Countries may lay the best Claim to it, because what they do, is by the Permission and allowance of the Romish Church, but the Article of Necessity; whereas these Dissenting Teachers washings are done when there is no Necessity to be urg'd, and in direct Opposition, and affront to, the Church of England. In this 16 P. Mr. Shaw shew'd us to mention a free Conference which happen'd at the last Episcopal Visitation here; an Account of which, he says, he received from a Person, who was then present. Who his Informer was, is not worth the Trouble of an Enquiry, that there are False Brethren among the Clergy, is very notorious, and unquestionable: But whoever

he was, I hope he was so faithful, as to give a full History of that Conference, and if he did, then I will take the Liberty to say, Mr. *Shaw* is not an Ingenuous Relator, he conceals part of the Interview for a Reason which may easily be guessed at, and that is, because it would injure his Cause.

It is to be remembered, (and to his Lordship's Honour I speak it,) that the Right Reverend the Bishop of this Diocess (Dr. *Hough*) publickly declar'd, that the Dissenting Teachers are not Ministers of Jesus Christ, but mere Laymen.

But this Opinion of his Lordships, Mr. *Shaw* takes no Notice of, because it evidently condemns him, and his Lay Ministrations, and the present Practice of Separation from the Church *England*.

It is also to be observed, that of all the Clergy who then attended their Bishop, there were not above three or four at the most, that approved Lay-Baptism; and I could mention the Observations, and Arguments, which were urg'd not only against Lay-Baptism, but against the Reading the Burial Office also over Unbaptized Persons. I might further repeat what a worthy Clergyman then declar'd from his own Knowledge, and Observation, viz. that the Refusal of Christian Burial to Unbaptized Children is so far from being attended with any bad Consequences, that on the Contrary, it had started the Parents into a Consideration of their Condition; whereupon they have determined, to have their Children Baptized, which afterwards should be born, and not only so, but have actually procured them to be Baptized by a Lawful Minister.

The same Observation others have likewise made, and Instances might be produced. But I am obliged to hasten to other Particulars. In this same Page, and Paragraph, Mr. *Shaw* presents the World with another of his *Heavy* Stories. He says, he

he has heard that a *Project* was formed at the Arch-Deacons Visitation, to engage all the Clergy to concur in the Refusal of the Burial Office; but that it was rejected, and the Paper containing the Agreement was soon stifled, and the Contributors of it, censured, as forward, and offending. To which I reply, that Mr. Shaw, or his Spy has given a wrong Turn, and Misrepresentation of all that Transaction, for the very Agreement which Mr. Shaw mentions in his Title Page, and other Places was then made. And because some Clergymen have been threatened to be prosecuted for such Refusal, particularly by Mr. Shaw, in a Speech made in his Conventicle, if his Hearers be not. It was (perhaps) agreed, further, that if any Clergyman should suffer in this Respect, the Cause should be Vindicated. And if no Paper was signed at that Time, a truer Reason may be assigned than this Dissenting Teacher, or his Correspondent has given. And among other Reasons this may be true, that the Clergy can depend upon each others solemn Promise.

Besides, it having been observed, that Mr. Shaw's Spy was crept in among the Clergy, it was thought prudent, to discourse as little upon the Subject as possible. And I remember it was then said, that Mr. Shaw would soon receive intelligence. Who this false Brother is, is needless to mention. Tho' he has subscrib'd the Homilies, he yet holds the Lawfulness of *Resistance* or *Rebellion*. Tho' he has been Ordain'd by a *Bishop*, he wishes well to *Presbytery*; and is altho' in *disaffection*, he can see no Schism in the *Dissenters*, tho' they are the worst *Schismatics*, because they renounce all *Episcopacy*, which the *Novatian*, and *Donatist* *Schismatics* never did. But P. 17. he says, 'the refusal of Burial is inconsistent with their own Practice, for adds he, the Clergy have made

no *Scapula of Daring*. The Children of Dissenters fall lately, wherefore he asks what new light they have receiv'd; that they must contradict their former, *stated Practice*. In this Paragraph our Author he affirms *fronously* as he is wont to do, but does not prove the point, which is a thing, that is, *now a days* expected. But if there be such Clergymen who are thus inconsistent with themselves, why did not this Gentleman in this place mention them.

If there be any who contradict their former, *stated Practice*. They are ready to shew what new Light they have received; provided he will at the same time give them satisfaction, and answer those *Queries*. When the late Ministry goes *Triumphant*, Mr. Shaw came occasionally to the Church, but of late has discontinued the Practice. *What new light then has he receiv'd, that he must now contradict his former, Occasional Practice? What he is in the right before? Suppose, he is in the Wrong now? Was he in the Wrong before? How comes it then to pass, that he has persisted in it till of late, for my part I am not able to reconcile this, and decide but conclude, that he is inconsistent with himself; for if his tender Conscience would permit him to go to Church when he pleas'd, what should hinder, (since the Terms of Communion are the same,) but he, and the rest of the Occasionalists may constantly repair thither especially when by so doing, they will promote the Peace, and Unity of Christ's Church. If (as *By* Stillingfleet mightly argues,) Occasional Conformity be lawful, constant Communion must be a Duty.*

As to the 2d. Branch of inconsistency, with respect to Parents and other Adult Persons, who, (he says,) obstinately refuse Episcopal Baptism, and shall yet be Buried with the Rights, (he means

means Rites) of the Church. The only answer that bold Assertion can receive is this, viz. that I believe our Author is guilty of a downright Falshood; and I challenge Mr. Shaw to produce one Instance of this Kind, or to mention the Name of any of *those* Clergymen, who are concerned in this Agreement, that have *reposed their Office* over any Dissenting Parent, whom they knew, had never receiv'd true Baptism. To what Mr. Shaw asserts, p. 18. of the Admission of unbaptiz'd Persons to the Lord's Supper, I may return the same answer. And I here again challenge him to Instance any of the Clergy, who since this agreement, have *knowingly and wilfully* admitted unbaptiz'd Dissenters to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and at any time *heretofore*, Dissenters have been admitted, such admission was perhaps the effects of surprise, or a Charitable Presumption that they were Baptiz'd, and after the example of several Dissenting Teachers, were come over from Schism to the Church of England, wherefore 'tis *barbarous* to reproach *them* for their Charity. One while the Clergy are blam'd for want of Charity, and another while, they are ridicul'd for shewing it. As to Mr. Shaw's slur at the Clergy, whom he styles *modern Divines*. The only remark I shall make is this; that these *modern Divines*, are at least, as well Skill'd in Divinity, as this *modern* Dissenting Teacher; they have had the happiness and honour of an *University Education*, which he cannot pretend to; they do not trade *chiefly* in *modern Dutch-Systems*, and *sedition rising Romphlets*; they do not learn *their Divinity* from a *Woolstun*, or a *Patent*, nor their Principles of Loyalty from a *Milton*, nor a *Toland*. No. *Their Education* has set them above such *Mean Attainments*. And they seek for Truth from Scripture, and

and Antiquity; and what is more, are able to read the sacred Writers, and ancient Fathers in their respective Originals.

Well! But here is another Argument in the same Page to prove that Persons sprinkled by Dissenting Teachers are Baptized, and therefore ought to be baptized, and that is, because the 11th Canon requires all Persons that are 15 Years Old, to come to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and adds he, (*Dissenters as well as others*) an Expression which is not to be found in the Canon, and therefore from thence the Reader may Judge of our Author's Sincerity. When that Canon was made, there was no Act of *Exemption*, or as 'tis falsely called, *Toleration* granted; for the Government required all Persons to hold Communion with the Establish'd Church as is visible in the 9th Canon, which forbids any to Dissent upon Pain of Excommunication *ipso facto*. And by the 10th Canon, if such Ministers as should refuse to subscribe to the Form and manner of God's Worship in the Church of England, prescribed in the Communion Book, and their Adherents, shall take unto them the Name of another Church not Established by Law, and shall dare to publish it; if they shall complain, that this their pretended Church hath of long time groan'd under the Burthen of certain Grievances impos'd upon it, and upon the Members thereof, by the Church of England, and the Orders and Constitutions therein by Law Established: Such shall be Excommunicated, and not restored, until they repent, and publickly revoke such their wicked Errors. By the 11th Canon those Persons are liable to the said Penalty, who shall affirm or maintain that there are other Meetings, Assemblies, or Congregations of the King's born Subjects, which may challenge to themselves the Name of true, and Lawful Churches. And by the 12th Canon, 'tis forbid any to affirm, that it is Lawful for any sort of Ministers,

and

and Lay-Persons to make Rules, Orders, or Constitutions in Causes Ecclesiastical, without the Kings Authority, which if they do, both they, and such as submit themselves to be ruled and governed by them, are Excommunicated ipso facto, and not to be restored until they repent, and publickly revoke their wicked, and Anabaptistical Errors. So that tho' all Persons above the Age of 16 Years, are required to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at Easter by the 11th Canon, upon Penalty of Presentment, yet, to be sure, those Persons who were to be so admitted, had been Baptized by a Lawful, Episcopal Minister, because none other were permitted to Baptize; all Persons were supposed to be of the Church of England, because no other Way of Worship, for the King's Subjects, of whatever Denomination, was then allowed. There were no Publick Dissenting-Conventicles, and Seminaries to perpetuate Schism, erected in those Days. Tho' the King was a Foreigner, He loved our Religion and our Country. That Dissenters are not supposed to be intended to be admitted to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is evident from this Consideration, that by the beforementioned Canons, Dissenters are reckon'd Excommunicated IPSO FACTO. * and therefore ought not to be admitted to a Participation of the Lord's Supper, and by the 27. Canon Schismatics are not to be admitted to the Communion. (See 27th Canon.)

Upon the Whole therefore, it is very apparent that Mr. Shaw's Quotation from the 11th Canon, and his Addition to it, are of no Service to his Cause.

Q

But

* By Excommunication ipso Facto, is meant Excommunicatio Major, i. e. The greater Excommunication, as appears by this Rule of the Canonists, *Excommunicatio simpliciter prolata intelligitur de majori*; and because they cannot be absolved but by the Arch-Bishop. See the Clergyman's *Vade mecum*. Chap. 9th. P. 146 of the 1st Edition, P. 149 of the 2d. Edition.

But suppose now that a Dissenting Parent were Baptized by an Episcopal Minister; I have not only shewn that he is not allowed by the Canons to receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, because he is a *Schismatick*, and *Excommunicated ipso facto*, but I proceed further to observe to the Reader, that in the Opinion of some very *Judicious* and *Learned* Persons, such Dissenter, (especially if he be a Leader into *Schism*, or *Popery*,) has no Right to the Office of *Burial*, because he is *Excommunicated ipso facto*, and according to the Rubrick before the *Burial* Office, that Office is not allowed to be used over an *Excommunicated Person*; * The Learned Author of the Clergyman's *Vade Mecum* affirms, that Leaders into *Popery*, or *Schism* are really *Excommunicated*, tho' they be not particularly by Name publish'd, or declar'd to be so. And that therefore a Minister may refuse to Bury them, if they die in this Condition, and no one be able to testify of their Repentance. For such Persons are declared *ipso facto Excommunicated* by Can. 2. 3. 4. 5. 9. And therefore I cannot understand upon what Reason, or Authority some Clergymen do permit some such Persons occasionally to receive the Communion, when they are really *Excommunicated*, and ought not to be permitted to come within the Church-Dogs.)

The 68th Canon, does indeed, require Curates to bury all, i.e. Baptized Persons, that are not denounced *Excommunicated* *Excommunicatione Majori*; but if we may believe the Canonists, PARTICULARLY LINDWOOD, 'tis a sufficient Denunciation, if it come to the Knowledge of the Person *Excommunicated* Lynd in Gloss. L. 3. T. 28. C. Sect. Princip. *Excommunicati*. So that the Curate who has taken care that his Parishioners, who are Promoters of *Po-*
pery

* See Clergyman's *Vade Mecum*, P. 146, 1st. Edition: 148, 2d. Edition.

' very and Schism be made sensible, that they are Ex-
 ' communicated by Canon, seems to be under no Obliga-
 ' tion to bury them, when they are dead; and so, if these
 ' Excommunications, thro' the Iniquity of the Times,
 ' and the Multitude of Offenders have no other Effect in:
 ' this World, yet they may at least serve to Indemnify a
 ' Clergyman for not doing so, absurd a Thing, as to Bu-
 ' ry the Corps of one, who has (perhaps) renounced his
 ' Baptism, or however dyed in a profess'd Hostility against
 ' the Church. I have now followed my Adversary
 ' (for so he has made himself without any Fault of
 ' mine,) as far as his 19 P. Where he affirms as is
 ' usual, that those who refuse Burial to Unbaptized
 ' Children, make no Scruple of Burying the profane-
 ' st Person in their Parish, and acknowledge God's great
 ' Mercy in taking to himself the Soul of their Dear
 ' Brother, and committing his Body to the Ground in
 ' sure and certain Hope of the Resurrection to Eternal
 ' Life. In this single Period of his, there is at once
 ' a very Uncharitable, Scandalous, and false con-
 ' struction put upon the words of the Burial Of-
 ' fice. One would have expected that a Gentle-
 ' man that has preach'd so much upon Charity and
 ' Moderation, would have construed the Words in
 ' the best Sense; for Charity believes all things, and
 ' hopes all things. But if by Reason of a visible
 ' Decay of Discipline, some have had the
 ' Burial-Office read over them, for whom the Church
 ' never designed it, the Dissenters should be the last
 ' that make Complaint, because they by their Schism,
 ' or Division, and their obstinate Rebellion against the
 ' Laws both of Church and State, have occasioned
 ' the Want of Discipline, and relaxed the Reins of
 ' Government. But to give a direct Answer: I see
 ' no Reason why we may not acknowledge God's
 ' Great Mercy in taking to himself the Soul of our
 ' dear Brother; especially when it is considered that
 ' by the Expression, we do not declare that the Person

inter'd is actually *saved*, but that his Soul is (as *Solomon* expresses it,) *Returned to God, who gave it*, in Order to be disposed of, to a State of Happiness, or Misery: And since the Deceased was made a Christian by Baptism, he may therefore be justly stiled a *Christian Brother*. But supposing he had been a bad Liver, why may not we call him a *Brother* especially since we find an Apostle, the great St. Paul himself allows that Title to one that walketh disorderly, 2. Thes. 3. c. 6, 15, v. To a Fornicator, or a Drunkard, 1. Cor. 5. C. 11. V. 'Tertullian in a general Sense as they are Men, alloweth even the *Heresies* to be accounted *Brethren*, tho' they be *Mali Fratres*, evil Brethren, in which Sense, the Dissenters themselves are sometimes stild *Brethren*.

As for the Expression in sure and certain Hope of **THE RESURRECTION** to *Eternal Life*; We do not thereby declare, that we absolutely believe that the Soul of the Deceased is *saved*, and that his Body will rise in the Resurrection of the just, to inherit *Eternal Glory*. No! The true meaning of the Expression I take to be this, that 'tis a solemn Profession that we believe (as our Creed expresses it,) the *Resurrection of the Dead* in general, and the *Life Everlasting*, that is to say, in other Words, that all Men, both just, and unjust, shall be raised at the last Day, by the Mighty Power of God displayed in that great Transaction, so receive according to that they have done, whether it be Good, or Evil. That the Expression is to be understood of the *Resurrection* in general is very evident from a Parallel Passage in the Office for the *Burial* of the Dead at Sea, which is a sufficient Explanation of the Sense of the Church in this Particular, for there the Expression

See Dr. Halkner's Interpretation of the Burial-Office in his *Libertas Ecclesiastica*, P. 291. the 3d. Edition.

is, *Looking for THE Resurrection of THE Body, and the Life of the World to come.* — Now if the Expression were intended to bear the Sense Mr. *Shaw* would *Palm* upon us, then the Words, *His*, or *Hers*, or *Its* Resurrection, or *His*, *Her*, or *This Body* would doubtless have been inserted, but since those Words are not, 'tis very plain, the Expression refers only to the *Resurrection* in general, as I have before explained it. Wherefore why we may not on so proper an Occasion as a Funeral profess our firm Belief of *The Resurrection of the Body, and the Life Everlasting*, as well as we do it every Day in our Creed, I am at a Loss to imagine. And then as for the other Objection which is raised by Dissenters, against this Expression, *as our hope is this our Brother doth*; Why we may not use it, even over *One* who has not lead an Exemplary Life, I must confess I am yet to learn. Does not *Charity hope all Things*? How comes it then to pass, that it must be a Fault, to say, we hope that the Soul of the Deceased Rests in Christ?

What! Tho' he did not Live as he ought to have done, is there no Place left for Repentance? Might he not be sensible of his Condition, and repent *Sincerely* of his Sins? And since no Man can say, that he is sure he is damned, I can see no Reason, why we may not say, we hope that he is saved. Besides, there are several Degrees of *Hope*, *One* of which is next to despair. When we have a Friend at Sea, and have heard Nothing of his Welfare for some time, and therefore am apt to fear he is cast away, yet since we are not *sure* that he is, 'tis very natural for us to say, and I have often heard it, that we hope he is safe. In a Word, it does not belong to *Us* to determine Men's Everlasting Fates; Instead of Judging others, let us be careful to Judge *Ourselves*, that we may not be *Judged*, i.e. Let us be strict in the Examination

nation of our own Lives and Conversations, in Order to amend them, and then shall we not be condemned by the Lord.

Our Author comes next p. 19. to the insignificancy of threatenng. I entirely agree with my Antagonist in what he says in the first Period, Namely that Burial, or the refusal of it, does neither good, nor harm to the Child, it's Soul is *gone before to God who gave it*, to be dispos'd of, as his Wisdom thinks fit. And whatever *Punishment* may be supposed to be inflicted, by the refusal of Burial, 'tis not design'd as a *Punishment* upon the Child, but upon the obstinate wicked Parents, who reject Baptism. That such refusal is done with a design to *gratify a revengeful Temper*, as this Charitable Man, plainly intimates. I am satisfy'd is not *true*. But perhaps he measures *Churchmen*, by a *Presbyterian Standard*; And because a certain Party is *malicious*, and *revengeful* even to a *Proverb*, he fancies, it may be, all the World is of the *same Disposition*. P. 20. he says that '*some Men have suppos'd that the relative Holiness of Ground can make a dead Child Holy*. He does not indeed. Name the Men, he leaves the Reader to Guess at them upon this occasion; And to be sure, they must be of the Clergy. But I know none of *them* that are so weak as to believe any such thing, or that Holy Ground can in the least '*add to the Child's Happiness*, as he would persuade the World, '*some Men have suppos'd*. But that there is a relative Holiness in places set apart for God's most Holy Worship, is not difficult to make appear. And if it be *Papery*, and *the Darkeness of Popery* to assert this truth, Mr. *Shaw* will make *Papery* as antient as *Moses*, which I am not inclin'd at all to believe. To put off the Shoes was the way in the *Eastern Coun-*

Countries, of shewing respect, as putting off the Hat is here with us.

Now why did God command *Moses*, * *Exodus* 3. c. 5. v. *to put off his Shoes from off his Feet?* Does not God himself give *Moses* this as the reason of the injunction, because *the place whereon thou standest is Holy Ground?* Why did the *Chaplain of the Lord's Host*, (i. e. *Michael the Arch Angel* as some Interpret it,) bid † *Joshua* to † *Joshua* loose his Shoe from off his Feet? Was 5. c. 15. v. it not for the same reason, because *the Place whereon thou standest is Holy.* Why does the Royal Preacher King *Salomon* say, § *Keep thy Foot when thou goest to the House of God.* Does he not speak § *Eccles.* 5. c. 1. v. in allusion to the Precept given to *Moses* and *Joshua* to pay a Reverence and respect, when they stood on *Holy Ground?* That there is a *relative Holiness* in the Places of Worship, or Churches where the Divine Presence more peculiarly resides, is, you see, not only evident from what I have just now said, but was also ever the Opinion of the *Jews*, who express'd their Reverence towards God, by putting off their Shoes at their entrance into the House of the Lord.

And as it was the Custom of most of the *Eastern Nations*, thus to signify their Reverence, so in imitation of them, * The *Æthiopick* Christians enter the Religious Assemblies with their Feet bare; the *Turks* do the like; nay, even the *Heathens* gave the same Testimonies of Reverence, when they went into the Temple of *APOLLO*.

But if there be no *relative Holiness* in the Places Dedicated to God's Worship, then I Demand

* See *Pool's Synopsis Criticorum*. in *Exod.* 3. c. 5. v.

mand a reason why our Blessed Saviour *cast out of the Temple, them that Sold and Bought? Why did he overthrow the Tables of the Money-Changers, and the Seats of them that Sold Doves? Was it not for their Profanation of the Outer Court of the Gentiles, which he look'd upon as a part of His House of Prayer? If then there can be no such thing as Holy Ground in a relative Sense, why did the Meek, the Holy Jesus express so high a resentment at these gross abuses? But to proceed. That of Children is the Kingdom of Heaven, I as firmly believe as Mr. Shaw does, because the Scripture asserts it. St. Mat. 19. c. 14. v. And I believe as our Church Teaches, * *that it is certain by God's Word, that Children which are Baptized, dying before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly SAVED.* And as for those who never received true Baptism, but were *washed* only by Laymen, I pass no Judgment upon them, but leave them to God's uncovenanted Mercy.*

* See the Declaration at the End of the Office of Publick Baptism,

But lest the Disciples of this Dissenting Teacher should be so *Stupid* as to imagine, that the *Reading Prayers over a dead Corps were of Service, he assures They will not do it any more Good than Burying it in Consecrated Ground.* A Notable Discovery! This! Who knows not that the Burial Service is imutely calculated for the Benefit of the Living? Indeed how can any Man think otherwise that reads it?

But to heighten the Prejudices of his People, and to evince his *Flaming Charity* for the Church, he steps out of his Way to *Hale* in a Reflexion upon our Constitution, he says, he *supposes that this Practice has been borrowed from the Papists, and yet grants there's no such Thing in the Burial Office*

Office, as praying for the Dead. Why then did he mention the Thing at all, since by his own Confession there is no Relation between the *One*, and the *Other*? Do I ask why he did it? 'Tis as plain as if wrote with a Sun-beam, that he designed this Reflexion to render the Church odious, were his Power equal to his *Malice*. If our Author had been well acquainted with the *Classicks*, he would (perhaps) have said that the Practice had been borrowed from the Heathens, because *Virgil* tells us, when the surviving Heathens took leave of their Deceased Friend, they bid him *Farewel* for ever.

Salva aeternum mihi, maxime Palla

Eternumq; vale, Æneid. 11. L. 99.

Had this Author either read, or made Enquiry, he might have inform'd himself that there is a great Difference between the *Obsequies*, or *Funeral Rites* of the Church of *England*, and those of *Rome*. Ours consists of Reading select Portions of Scripture, and offering up Prayers for surviving Christians; suitable to the present Occasion; whereas the *Romanists*, (besides their Prayers for the Dead, grounded upon the gainful Fiction of *PURGATORY*) *Use vain and ridiculous Blasphemy of the Grave, sprinkling it with holy Water, perfuming it with Incense, &c. prescribed by the Roman Office.* * But since nothing of this Sort is practised by the Church of *England*, the World may see what little Reason Mr. *Shaw* has to suspect that this Practice of Reading Prayers over the Dead is borrowed from the *Papists*.

But since Mr. *Shaw* is so puzzled, and at such a mighty Loss to know from whence this Practice is derived, I that am a *Junior Clergyman* will presume to inform him. As the *Primitive Church* was the Model by which the Church of *England* was reformed, so that in this Particular, *This Church*

R

imi

* See Mr. *Wheatley's* Church of England Man's companion, or, Illustration; &c. of the Common-Prayer. P. 171.

imitates her Example. Now that it was the Custom among the Primitive Christians to inter their fellow Christians with Funeral Rites, and Ceremonies, particularly by repeating Psalms and Hymns, will appear from the following Testimonies.

The Apostolical Constitutions say, *When the Dead are carried out, the Congregation must sing as they bring them along, in Case they be Believers in the Lord.* (Constitu. Apost. Lib. 6.) This Custom Gregory of Nazianzen calls *To sing the Office of carrying out the Dead.* (Greg. Naz. Orat. in Soror.) of this St. Chrysostome speaks when he says,

What mean the Hymns: Do not we praise God, and give Thanks unto him, that he has, now for the future crowned the deceased Person? For that he has eased him from his Labours? For that he has removed him from all Fear, and taken him to himself? Are not the Funeral Hymns instituted for this Reason? Is not this the Occasion of the PSALMODIES? Now are not all these Things Signs of Persons who rejoice? [Chrys. Hom. IV. in Epi. ad Heb.] And he also mentions the Psalms which were used to be sung upon that Occasion, *Think what you sing at that Time, Return thou unto thy Rest, O my Soul, for the Lord hath beautifully rewarded thee.* Psalm 116. 7. v. And again, *I will not fear any Evil, for thou art with me.* Psalm 23. 4. *Thou art my hiding Place, thou shalt preserve me from Trouble.* Psalm 32. 7. St. Jerome in the Life of Paulus Bremia says, that Anthony Prohara for a corpse Pauli Hymns & Psalmos, de Christiana traditione decantasse. Sung Hymns and Psalms, according to the Christian Tradition, as St. Paul's Body was carried out. Since then the Primitive Church inter'd the Deceased after so solemn and decent a Manner, why do some Men so much wonder at our Church

* See Dr. Nichols's Commentary on the Common Prayer, his Notes before the Burial Office, Fol. Edit. And Dr. Comber on the Common Prayer, Part 4th. P. 390, Ed. 8vo.

for doing the like? Why *Forsyth*, must this Practice be branded as a Piece of *Popery* & *Pratenders*. A certain Faction would be at a Stand how to disturb the Kingdom. As to the Assertion, which Mr. *Shaw* calls *Truth*, Namely, that 'Some of our small Figures in the Church, do maintain the Lawfulness of Paying for the Dead,' I solemnly believe it *False*, and a gross *Calumny*, and whatever the deceased Author of *Primitive Doctrines* wrote & might think, it does not therefore follow, that Dr. *Hicks*, who wrote a Preface to the Book is of that Opinion; But put the Case that it were the Opinion of Dr. *Hicks* or the late Learned Dr. *Grabe* deceased, such private Opinion is not the Opinion of the Church of *England*, and therefore the mention of it is Nothing to the Purpose.

In the next Paragraph P. 22. Our Author publishes another of his *Haar-fay-Story*, which it seems, he is well stock'd with. He says that 'a certain Curate, (by whom, tis known he means Mr. *Harris*,) being sent to bury the Child of a Dissenter in his Parish, wrote him Word, that for the good of his Child he would bury it, if some mentioned Conditions were complied with. To which I answer.

That this is a *Slander* upon Mr. *Harris*. I affirm it upon certain Knowledge, because it so happened, that I saw and read the very Letter Mr. *Harris* wrote to his *Dissenting Parishianer*, a Copy of which, well attested is now in the Hands of Mr. *John Hodge*, Bookseller in *Derby* for any one's Satisfaction.

I am now come 3. to the Advice he gives his Followers, which is 'not to desert the Dissenting Interest, nor to be frightened from their Profession.' This is a Doctrine he has frequently inculcated, and especially since her Majesty has made Choice of so *Excellent* a Ministry, he has insisted much upon

upon the Point of Persecution; if one were to regard the senseless Clamours of a Party, they would make one believe, (if possible,) that Popery and the Pretender are landed at Dover; that the Queen (whom God long preserve) is in a Plot to dethrone Her self, that the Parliament, Ministry, and Clergy long to be perjured, nay, one would be tempted to suppose that *Smithfield* were once more blazing with flaming Faggots, and another *Fox* were actually employed to make a new *Martyrology*. But to return to our Author.

Tho' the Dissenters are extremely shock'd to hear, that *their Teachers* are *no Ministers*, and *their Children* are *no Christians*, yet instead of proving the one, or the other, he proceeds only to advise the Parents to bring their Children to him to be sprinkled, *if they be of his own Congregation*; and if they live in the Country, and cannot in Case of Illness have their Children sprinkled, it is observable, that he does not direct 'em to desire the *Lawful Minister* of the Parish to *Baptize* them, but is willing they should die without Baptism: And to comfort the Parents Hearts, he says their Children are not damn'd as *Papists*, *they falsely pretend, and some others after them, who tie Salvation to Baptism*; Nay, he affirms further, That *The Child of a Christian Parent is a Christian as soon as it is born*. As to what he says of Children being damn'd: I answer whatever the Papists hold in that particular, is nothing at all to the Church of *England*, and I know no Churchman, and I dare say, Mr. *Shaw* neither, that is so uncharitable as to believe that a Child is damn'd, who, thro' the neglect, or Obstinacy of his Parent, has died without Baptism.

Nay, I affirm further, that Churchmen are *more Charitable* than Presbyterians, for the Presbyterian Notion is, that none but *Elect Infants* are *saved by Christ, thro' the Spirit*. So *what* unless Mr.

Shaw

Shaw be sure as he cannot be, that this, or that Infant be of the Number of the Elect, he cannot say it is saved, if he does, he *contradicts* the 10th. Article of the Confession of Faith of the *Kirk of Scotland*. *

As to his strange Assertion that '*the Child of a Christian Parent is a Christian as soon as it is born*. I answer that the Expression is too Loose and Unguarded, and includes more than will be granted, for it takes in all sorts of Dissenters, Sectaries that pretend to believe in *Christ*. But here it were natural to expect that he would have proved the *Dissenting* Parents *themselves* to be *Christians*, which I believe is a Task he is not able to surmount, there being some that were never Baptized at all. Wherefore how can a Person be properly said to be a *Christian*, that was never lifted into *Christ's* Service by *Baptism*? Can a Child be said to be a *believing* Christian that is not capable of *Knowing*, or *Believing* any thing at all? Can it be said to be a *Baptiz'd Christian*, that was never *Baptized* at all? In what Sense then does he understand the Word *Christian*? Why did he not illustrate this *Position* by Scripture, or Antiquity? But since he does it not from *Either*, 'tis a plain Evidence that it has no Foundation.

In a Word, if a Child is a *Christian* without *Baptism*, What Occasion then is there for *Christian Baptism*? Baptism according to this *Presbyterian* Notion is nothing else but a Piece of *Pageantry*, a mere Ceremony, and *Formality*. Nay, may not the Quakers argue *ad homines* with the *Presbyterians* that *Water-Baptism* is unnecessary and insignificant, for does not Mr. *Shaw* say that '*a Child of a Christian Parent is a Christian as soon as it is Born*. To what purpose then serves your *Water-Bap-*

* See the Abstract of the Confession of the Faith of the Kirk of Scotland, in Mr. *Chamberlayne's* Present State of Great Britain. P. 434. Art. 19. Anno 1708.

Baptism? They Quakers without Question must adopt this Gentleman a Friend, and when they hear what a *Concession* is made in *their* Favour Doubtless the *Miraling* will receive an Invitation from the *Whitsun-Week* Assembly of Deputies, to come over *intirely* to their **PURER SECT.**

And thus I have waited upon my Adversary thro' every Page of his Performance. In these Sheets which I now publish to the World, I have, I hope, fully prov'd the Points I have undertook, if I am Mistaken in any particular, I shall be Obliged to any Person that will be so much my *Friend*, as to shew wherein the Mistake consists.

As I verily believe that the Dissenting Teachers *Washings* are no more than *Lay-Baptisms*, so I make no Scruple *plainly* and *frankly* to declare my *Reasons* why I think so, and as I believe that no *Unbaptized* Person is entituled to the *Burial-Office* of the Church, (as is plain from the Rubrick of it, he is not) so I make no Scruple to say, that, I think, that the Case of the Clergy who refuse *Burial*, to the *Unbaptized*, is very defensibly, and that they act very *Consistently* and *agreeably* to the Laws of our Church. If in some Places I have expressed my self something *Warmly* when I speak of some Men's *Obstinate* Opposition to *Episcopacy*, the heinous, and damning Sin of *Schism*, which the Dissenters of all Denominations are guilty of, and the *double* Practices of others; It is both excusable, and warrantable, when 'tis considered, that our *Blessed Saviour* Himself, his *Apostles* and the *Primitive Writers* have *sharply rebuk'd* some Vices. And indeed as a worthy Divine * of our own rightly expresses it, "to speak *Softly*, and *Strake* such People, as are continually *Straking* themselves, does but tempt their *Disdain*, and *Confirm* them in their *sins*. *Gentle Usage* is taken for *Se-*

cret

erect Veneration, and serves only, to feed their *Pride* and cocker their *Presumption*, and makes them think, because they are not *Lashed*, that therefore they don't deserve it.

What good effects will result from this Discourse, I do not pretend to know. If the arguments here offered, prevail nothing upon *those* that are *misguided*, tis to be hoped, they may settle, and confirm those that are *within* the Communion of the Church, and if they will be profitable in *any* respect, I shall never repent my *Labor*. 'Tis my very earnest desire, and utmost ambition to do all the Service possible I can to Truth, and the Church of *England*.

And whatever the *Dissenters* may think, or be informed by their Seducers, I can truly say, and do faithfully assure them, (those *mistaken* People particularly of my own Parish) that I have not the least ill-will towards their Persons, their Errors are the things I have an aversion to, and would persuade them to renounce.

The *Dissenters* justly blame the *Papists* from yielding an implicit Faith, to whatever their Priests affirm, and yet *these* run also into the very same mistake, they CHIEFLY see with the Eyes, and hear with the Ears of their Teachers. Whereat would they but lay aside their *prejudices*, and weigh, and consider things impartially, as others have done before them, would they but read, and hear what is against their Practice, as well as for it, would they but consult their true Spiritual Guides, and Pastors, I doubt not, but by the Blessing of GOD, they might receive conviction; And oh! would to GOD they would be so kind to themselves as to consider their Danger! I heartily beseech them, for the sake of their precious Souls to consider what the nature, and Guilt of that grievous Sin of Schism is; which is a Separation where no just occasion

is

is given, from the Communion of the Church of England.

What an *Happy* People should we be, if they would follow St. Paul's Advice, and keep the *Unity of the Spirit, in the Bond of Peace*. If the **DISSENTING TEACHERS** would repent of their *Usurpations* upon the Priesthood, and together with their *deluded* followers, would submit to the Government of the Apostles Successors, THE **BISHOPS**, would they attend upon the Ministry of their truly **ORDAIN'D** and *Lawful* Pastors; **ENVY**, and **UNCHARITABLENESS**, **RASH CENSURE**, and **MALICE**, **EVIL SPEAKING** and **SLANDER**, and all other malignant Consequences of an *unreasonable* and *causeless* Separation; would sooner cease. We might then more *vigorously* oppose the *declard* Enemies of *Christianity*. And since Unity is by the *Papists* made a Note of the *true* Church, were we at *Unity* among ourselves, we might then hope to prevail upon that *grossly deluded* People, it being very certain, that nothing so much hinders *their* Conversion, as the *unhappy* Divisions among *Protestants*.

We might then hope to convince the *Heathen* World, and induce *Unbelievers* to *Worship* God in the same excellent way, and to report that *God is in us of a truth*. 1 Cor. 14. c. 25. v. May they be so wise with regard to their own eternal Happiness as not to *frustrate* the endeavours which are us'd to *conduct* them thither!

May they, by the practice of **UNITY**, and all other *Christian* Duties, so engage the *favour* of **GOD**, that they may be sav'd among the *true* **ISRAELITES**, and find *Mercy* in the Day of the **LORD JESUS**.

F I N I S.

Appendix.

SINCE Mr. *Shaw* approves so well of the Opinions of the Right Reverend the Bishops of *Sarum*, and *Oxford* in the Case of Lay-Baptism, 'tis to be hop'd, he, and the rest of his Principles will approve of their Lordships Opinions, and be directed by their Good Advice in other Cases.

Numb. I.

The Bishop of *Sarum* directly charges the Dissenters with the Guilt of the heinous Sin of *Schism*, and gives his Reasons for it, which are very strong and true.

This appears from his Lordship's Letter from *Salisbury* 27: June, 1708.

For Mr. John Agate, at S. Mary-Arches,
Exeter.

SIR,

THOUGH you are unknown to me, and the Injustice I have met with in some Attempts of this Kind, might suggest some Cause of Jealousy; yet on this Occasion I will use no Reserves, because 'tis upon a Subject in which I never used any.

Since ever I was capable of forming Principles, I saw so much Evidence in THIS, that In whatever Society of Christians we live, we ought not to make a RENT in that BODY, nor depart from

S

Communion with it, unless there is some UNLAWFUL CONDITION of Communion, either in Doctrine, or Practice, that I could never once doubt of its Truth. THIS can be the only Measure by which we are to govern our selves, with Relation to those among whom we live. For tho' we are more at Freedom, if we have any share in the Regulative, and not in the private Capacity of Subjected Christians, we ought only to govern our selves by THIS; Whether are the Terms of Communion LAWFUL, or UNLAWFUL? Examples, or no Examples, are only to be considered by Legislators; and in Matters that are no Way determined, but are left at Liberty. This Principle being laid down, then whosoever separates, are bound to shew what is UNLAWFUL in the Communion from which they withdraw: Otherwise they make the RENT, that, is the SCHISM: And therefore all those who separate from us, without so much as pretending that there are unlawful Terms of Communion among us, are MANIFESTLY guilty of SCHISM. The Case varies in those, who are persuaded there is something unlawful in our Communion: For tho' I verily believe there is Nothing unlawful in our Communion; all the Objections to any Thing among us, being very weak, grounded on great Mistakes, and often fully answered; yet if a Man is really under a Persuasion to the Contrary, in which after all his Endeavours to satisfy himself, he remains still under those Apprehensions, this Man, if his Ignorance is not Voluntary, Wilful, and Affected, may be in a State of Grace and Pardon for all that. This must be left to God, who only knows the Secrets of Men's Hearts, their inward Dispositions, and sincere Endeavours. So such a SEPARATION is still a SCHISM in it self, whatever the Condition of him who so separates may be.

THESE

THESE Principles I have owned very publick-ly above 40 Years : And tho' I use no hard Words, and give no Names to those who differ from Us ; yet I have always shew'd, this flow'd from no distrust of our Cause ; but it was because I thought I was bound in Meekness to instruct those who oppose themselves : In which, I thank God, I have found so much quiet, and have had such constant Success, that no Censures, nor ill Usage can prevail on me, to change my Method. I give you leave to make what Use of this you please. I pray God bless you, and your Labours. I am, SIR,
Your most Obedient, and Humble Servant,
GI. SARUM.

The same Bishop in his Book, call'd, *The Four Discourses to the Clergy of the Diocese of Sarum*, Discourse the 4th speaks thus, P. 266. London Edition. 1694. 'A wanton cavelling at every Thing, the breaking of an Established Order, the making Divisions, and the drawing of Parties, the Quarrelling about nicer Points of Speculation; or some lesser Matters in Rituals, do Occasion much Passion and Animosity, they take Men much off from the great Ends of Religion, they divide Christians from one another, and sharpen them against one another.

P. 268. — 'Our Saviour in his last and longest Prayer to the Father, when he was interceding for his Church, he has repeated this Prayer so often, no less than five times, in no very long Prayer, that *they might be one, and be kept and made perfect in one* ; and the Unity prayed for is so sublime, that it is compared to that Unconceivable Unity, or Union that was between the Father and the Son ; and by this the World was to be convinced of the Truth of his Religion. *That the World might believe that the Father had sent him.*

‘ More needs not be said upon this Head to
 ‘ make it evident, that it is of the greatest impor-
 ‘ tance to the Christian Religion; to maintain an
 ‘ entire Union among its Members; and that the
 ‘ chief Mean of doing this, is their uniting them-
 ‘ selves in the same Acts of Worship. See more at
 large in the said Discourse.

And because the Dissenters pretend to clear
 themselves from the Guilt of Schism by urging
 the *Toleration*, The same Bishop assures us in the
 Epistle prefix’d, P. 7: ‘ That the Toleration that
 ‘ the Law gives them, does not alter the Nature
 ‘ of Things, nor make an unjust Separation to be
 ‘ one whit the Lawfuller then it was when they
 ‘ were under a severer Yoke. The Law only gives
 ‘ a Civil Impunity, and does not punish: But the
 ‘ Cause of the Separation is the same that it was,
 ‘ and is neither better nor worse, whether the Se-
 ‘ paration is punished, or not.

To the same Purpose his Lordship expresses him-
 self in his *Pastoral Care*, London Edition, 1692, 4to.

‘ We are not to think, that the *Toleration* under
 ‘ which the Law has settled Dissenters does either
 ‘ absolve them from the Obligations that they
 ‘ lay under before, by the Laws of God, and the
 ‘ Gospel, to maintain the *Unity of the Church*, and
 ‘ not to rent it by unjust, or Causeless Schisms, or
 ‘ us from using our Endeavours to bring them to it,
 ‘ by the Methods of Persuasion and Kindness.

The Bishop of Oxford in his Charge Page 2. says,
 ‘ Our *Romish Adversaries* — have not fail’d ever
 ‘ since the *Reformation*, to endeavour the Ruin of
 ‘ this Church, which is the Glory and Bulwark of
 ‘ it, by sowing and fomenting Divisions among us:
 ‘ And God knows, they have been too successful
 ‘ in those Endeavours; which have done much
 ‘ more Hurt to us, and Service to them, than all
 ‘ their Invasions, Massacres, and Conspiracies.

Every

‘ Every one sees, and every good Man laments
 ‘ the great Numbers of People, who have been, and
 ‘ are separated from our Communion, and form’d
 ‘ into several Sects of various Denominations, by
 ‘ the Artifices of Priests and Jesuits, who at first
 ‘ *crept in unawares among them.* I heartily wish, that
 ‘ those who are unhappily engaged in those Se-
 ‘ parations, would seriously consider who first be-
 ‘ gan them, and whose Work they are doing by
 ‘ Keeping them up.

Again P. 4. ‘ We are bless’d, God ‘be praised for
 ‘ it, with a Church truly Primitive and Apostolical,
 ‘ in her Doctrine, Discipline, Worship, and in her
 ‘ whole Constitution; and we cannot too highly
 ‘ prize our Happiness in being Members of her.

‘ And P. 18. Speaking of Lay-Baptisms, and Lay-
 ‘ Baptizers, says, ‘ Am I pleading for these irregular
 ‘ Practices, or Justifying these intruding Adminis-
 ‘ trators? God forbid: *Fieri non debet*, these Things
 ‘ ought not to be; and they will be answerable to
 ‘ God and his Church, who usurp an Office to
 ‘ which they were not call’d.

Number 2.

As I have asserted that a great many of those
 who performed Ministerial Acts in the Grand Re-
 bellion, and Usurpation had been ordained before
 by Bishops, so I here set down a few of them.

Dr. Gillingham, 2 Ministers of St. Gregorys Parish
 Dr. Hewit, 5 near St. Pauls London.

Dr. Sanderson Rector of Boothby, Pagnel in Lin-
 colnshire. Besides, many others who performed Di-
 vine Office privately as occasion serv’d, and Sheldon
 afterwards A. B. of Canterbury. Dr. Hammond.
 Dr. Heylin. Mr. Thompson of Staffordshire, &c.

Number 3.

A few of those who perform’d Ministerial Acts
 during the *Grand Rebellion*, and *Usurpation*, who re-
 fus’d to conform, but were Episcopally Ordain’d.

Mr.

Mr. *Ferdinando Pool* of *Thrumpton* in *Nottinghamshire*, Grandfather by the Mother's Side to Mr. *Shaw*.
 Mr. *Hughes* of *Plimouth*. Mr. *Calvert* of *Tork*. Mr. *Edmund Calamy* of *London*. Mr. *John Crompton*, he usurp'd upon Mr. *Greaves* Rector of *Brailsford* in *Derbyshire*; He was the Father of Mr. *Abraham Crompton* the present great Supporter of *Schiism* in *Derby*. Mr. *Thomas Swetnam* and many more whom the present Mr. *Calamy* a Dissenting Teacher shews, were Episcopally Ordain'd. See his Account of the Ministers, who were ejected the Livings they had usurped by the *Bartholomew Act*,

Postscript.

Our Church Prohibiting the Burial-Office to be used for Persons who die Unbaptiz'd, is but agreeable to an ancient Practice of the Church. For the first Council of *BRACARA*, which was held A. D. 561. determines thus. *Item placuit Catechumenis Sine Redemptione Baptismi defunctis, neque oblationis commemoratio, neque psallendi impendatur officium.* It seemeth good to us, that as for Catechumens, who die before they have Redemption of Baptism, there should be no Oblations, or Commemorations made for them, neither should the Office of *Mass*, be used at their Funerals. *Con. 1. BRAC. Can. 35.* See Dr. *Nichol's* Commentary on the Common-Prayers in the Burial-Office, See Dr. *Gibson's Codex juris Ecclesiast.* under the Title of *Burial*.

The Reader is desired to Correct the Errors of the Press.



